4-1-2002

Nebraska public high school principals' perceptions of how state standards impact schools

Mark William Weichel
University of Nebraska at Omaha

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

NEBRASKA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW STATE STANDARDS IMPACT SCHOOLS

by

Mark William Weichel

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Dr. Bruckner

Omaha, Nebraska

April, 2002

UMI Number: 3044995

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

DISSERTATION TITLE

NEBRASKA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS

OF HOW STATE STANDARDS IMPACT SCHOOLS

BY

MARK WILLIAM WEICHEL

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED	DATE
Martha Bruckner Signature	4-12-2002
Martha Bruckner Typed Name	4-12-2002
Larry Dlugosh Signature	4-12-02
Larry Dlugosh Typed Name	4-12-2002
Gary Hartzell Signature	4-12-02
Gary Hartzell Typed Name	4-12-2002
Laura Schulte Signature	4-12-02
Laura Schulte Typed Name	4-12-2002
Neal Grandgenett Signature	4-12-02
Neal Grandgenett Typed Name	4-12-2002
Signature	
Typed Name	

University of Nebraska at Omaha
Graduate College

Acknowledgements

Completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the key support of a few special people:

- My wife, Jennifer, for your understanding and support through not only the process of completing this paper but also all of the evening classes and time reserved for coursework;
- My daughter, Marisa, for being a wonderful stress reliever and play partner;
- My father, Harry, who not only served as a mentor, role-model, and counselor, but also as a secretary when it came time to get the envelopes and other materials ready;
- My mother, Arlyne, for helping me discover a writing style years ago, hers;
- My chair and former high school principal, Dr. Martha Bruckner, who has taken a special interest in my academic and professional career;
- My former instructor, Dr. Laura Schulte, for providing support, guidance, and editing through chapters 1-4;
- My committee members, Dr. Martha Bruckner, Dr. Larry Dlugosh, Dr. Neal Grandgenett, Dr. Gary Hartzell, and Dr. Laura Schulte, for providing me with direction, insight, and constructive criticism;
- Bellevue Public Schools and particularly my Principal, Mr. Dan Larson, and Superintendent, Dr. John Deegan, for supporting my academic and career advancement;

- The faculty, support staff, and leadership team at Bellevue East High School for their words of encouragement and interest in my goals; and
- The high school principals who provided the data for this study.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW STATE STANDARDS IMPACT SCHOOLS

Mark W. Weichel, Ed. D.

University of Nebraska, 2002

Advisor: Dr. Martha Bruckner

The standards/assessment/accountability education reform movement was developed with the intention of creating a system where students could reach a higher level of educational achievement (Berkson, 1997). Now that practically every state, including Nebraska, has begun implementing state standards and ensuing accountability measures, the question remains as to whether these measures will truly reach their initial objective. Additionally, questions have arisen on the state, local, and national levels about how standards will impact teachers, students, administration, resource allocation, and instruction.

The purpose of this survey study was to test whether Nebraska high school principals perceive state standards will greatly impact schools in the state of Nebraska. Specifically, research questions sought to determine principals' perceptions of the possible effects of Nebraska state standards and whether or not differences existed between areas such as principals' gender, age, schools' free and reduced lunch percentage, school classification, years as an administrator, and amount of prior standards/assessment/accountability training.

The survey used to accomplish this was adapted from the work by Duke, Tucker, and Heinecke (2000) and Johnson (1981). After a pilot study was conducted,

all 293 Nebraska public high school principals were asked to participate in this study. After two separate mailings, 261 (89%) surveys were completed. Statistical tests utilized included descriptive statistics, t-tests, and analyses of variance (ANOVAS). Based on the findings, eight major themes were discovered, which provided answers to the seven research questions.

The results of this study provide information about Nebraska public high school principal's perceptions of state standards. The findings may have implications for state education leaders, school administrators on all levels of leadership, and university professors who analyze administration programs and degree requirements.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

School reforms have been suggested since the very beginning of the American education system (Bauman, 1996). The latest wave of reform has been the effort to establish standards that are intended to enable students to reach a higher level of educational achievement (Berkson, 1997). Now that 49 of our nation's states have adopted standards (all but Iowa), it appears that state and national standards are sweeping the nation like no other time in history (Jones, 2000). This is somewhat unique because topics involving education have historically and traditionally been a matter of state or local interest. However, the issue of standards has aroused the interest of individuals on all levels across the country including "federal and state legislators, presidential and gubernatorial candidates, teacher and subject matter specialists, councils, governmental agencies, and private foundations" (Glaser & Linn, 1994, p. 273). Additionally, there are 45 million American school children in K-12 education, and their teachers and administrators are all influenced in one way or another by standards. With over one-fifth of the United States population directly affected or influenced by standards, it could be considered the most significant government intervention since the New Deal (Lemann, 2000). No wonder many believe that historians will identify the last decade as the time when a concentrated press for national education standards became the norm (Glaser & Linn, 1994).

Considering the interest this issue generates, understanding the implications of standards-based reform is absolutely critical for building principals and the stakeholders who look to them for answers including teachers, students, parents, and

other community members. Unfortunately, becoming informed on the topic is not an easy task since much of the information that can be studied is found in varying formats. For example, there is no universally accepted definition of the term "standards". Writers have variously defined it as content, performance, opportunity to learn, hire, higher, world class, curriculum, certification, and power (Glickman, 2000/2001; Houston, 2000; Lewis, 1995; Marzaon & Kendall, 1995; Nave, Miech, & Mosteller, 2000; Noddings, 1997; Ravitch, 1995a; Reigeluth, 1997; Resnick & Nolan, 1995a; Zmuda & Tomaino, 1999). When determining the starting point for the national standards movement, some researchers point to a debate that began with the Committee of Ten and the Cardinal Principles of Education in the late 19th century (Mirel & Angus, 1994); others to the publication of a *Nation at Risk* in 1983 (Bonstingl, 2001; Maher, 2001; Meier, 2000; Ravitch, 1995a), and still others to a governor's summit held in Virginia in 1989 (Hardy, 2000; Jennings, 1998; Olson, 2001; Stotsky, 2000).

The arguments presented by proponents and opponents of the standards movement compound the confusion. Do high-test scores indicate student learning? Do standards create equity? Do standards promote excellence in student achievement? Do standards create a positive aura of business-like accountability? Each of these questions could be answered in a multitude of ways. One thing, however, is certain. Standards-based reform will impact schools and their staffs, students and community members for years to come (Abbott, 1997; Bauman, 1996; Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Bohn & Sleeter, 2000; Domenech, 2000; Eisner, 2001; Hardy, 2000; Hess & Brigham, 2000; Hoff, 2000; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000; Kohn,

2001; Lemann, 2000; Main, 2000; Neill, 1998; Noddings, 1997; Ohanian, 2001; Popham, 1999, 2000; Reigeluth, 1997; Resnick & Nolan, 1995a; Robinson & Brandon, 1994; Shanker, 1995; Sousa, 1998; Sylwester, 1995; Thernstrom, 2000; Umphrey, 1999; Wolf & White, 2000; Zmuda & Tomaino, 1999). Principals will be required, directly or indirectly, to provide time and funding for teachers to take part in the many activities that the standards-based reform requires, provide intense staff development, make difficult decisions about new staffing and resource allocation plans, learn skills necessary for implementing a successful testing climate, and learn strategies of dealing with teachers who do not cope well with the change effort. Principals in smaller communities have a host of additional concerns that they must deal with in order to successfully implement standards (Angaran, 1999; Berman, Cross, & Evans, 2000; Bezy, 1999; Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Hirsch, 1999; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000; Johnson, Treisman, & Fuller, 2000; Jones, 2000; Kearns & Harvey, 2000/2001; King & Bunce, 1999; McColskey & McMunn, 2000; Schmoker & Marzano, 1999).

While much has been written about standards, information about principal perceptions of their implications has been extremely limited. In fact, searches on electronic databases such as ERIC, First Search, and Dissertation Abstracts International found literally thousands of articles that related to education standards but only a very small handful that addressed stakeholder perceptions of their impact. In the last 25 years, one study has examined how students perceive their state's standards (Bacon, 1999), two have focused on administrator perceptions of the minimal competency standards movement of the early 1980s (Harris, 1981; Johnson,

1981), and one has focused on principal perceptions of Virginia's standards movement (Duke, Tucker, & Heinecke, 2000). While the latter study is similar to this one, it was done on a very small scale as it only included 16 Virginia high school principals. No published reports have attempted to examine how all of their states' high school principals perceive a set of state standards would impact their schools. This study attempted to fill the void in the current literature.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this survey study was to test how principals perceive state standards will impact schools in the state of Nebraska. As a result of Nebraska Legislative Bill 812, passed in the spring of 2000, all public schools registered with the state department in the state of Nebraska will be heavily involved in the standards movement. This bill, which calls for a school-based and teacher led assessment process, requires each local school district to develop its own standards and assessment tools, report annually on students' progress on locally developed standards, and to annually participate in a state-wide writing assessment (Roschewski, Gallagher, & Isernhagen, 2001). The study examined principal perceptions of how these standards will impact their schools. This study looked for various demographic differences in the sample studied, such as differences between principals in large and small schools.Research Questions

1. What are the possible effects of Nebraska state standards as perceived by principals?
2. Is there a difference between male and female principal perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact their schools?

3. Is there a relationship between a principal's age and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
4. Is there a relationship between a principal's school's free and reduced lunch percentage and his/her perception of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
5. Is there a relationship between school enrollment and a principal's perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
6. Is there a relationship between a principal's years as an administrator and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
7. Is there a relationship between a principal's amount of prior standards/assessment/accountability training and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Theoretical Perspective

The study was grounded in change theory developed by Kurt Lewin (1951a; 1951b). Change theory has been used to study and help explain what happens when a change process occurs in organizations. Change theory contends that all organizations experience successive steps of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing when implementing change. Unfreezing is the process of moving away from the restraining forces that hold the organization in a state of equilibrium. This requires

painfully learning new skills or concepts while experiencing a loss in identity. The next phase, changing, is the actual movement from one system to another. This is a difficult step because people, by nature, prefer a predictable routine and, given a choice, would like to remain stable and rely on the familiar. Refreezing is what happens when the organization experiences a sense of equilibrium with the new system in place. This last step is complete when the change becomes the culture and the expected way things are done at the organization from that point forward (Evans, 1996; Kotter, 1995, 1996; Schein, 2001).

This theory predicts that the implementation of Nebraska state standards will impact Nebraska high school principals' perceptions because principals will be asked to move their schools through this difficult change process that will require unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. At the time of this study, schools, administrators, and their teachers were in the process of moving from unfreezing to changing. Based on change theory, it was expected that principals would not only be witnessing resistance from stakeholders but also experiencing their own discomfort and concerns. Therefore, the research questions and survey sought to examine how principals perceive this change may impact their schools.

Definition of Terms

- Accountability. The concept of educators being held responsible for student achievement and students for their scores on standardized tests (National Forum on Assessment, 1995).

- Assessment. The process of gathering information about students in order to assist in determining various decisions and actions (National Forum on Assessment, 1995).
- Criterion-Referenced Test. A test that allows its users to make score interpretations based on what a student knows and can do. These scores are not dependent upon the scores of other students' knowledge (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998; U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2000).
- High Stakes Testing. The use of an assessment to determine certain consequences such as graduation and grade retention for students and pay raises and job retention for educators (American Educational Research Association, 1999).
- Norm-Referenced Test. A test designed to provide a comparison of how well a certain student does in comparison to a nationally representative sample (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).
- Performance Standard. A level of performance desired by the author of the standard (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, 2000).
- Principal. An educator in a school system utilizing an educational administrative endorsement earned from an accredited college or university in order to be a formal leader of a school.

- Rule 10. Regulations and procedures for the accreditation of schools as determined by the Nebraska Department of Education. Among other requirements, the rule indicates that all schools will issue a norm-referenced assessment (Nebraska State Department of Education, 2000).
- School Size. In the state of Nebraska, schools are classified as Class A, B, C, or D based on school enrollment. Class A is reserved for the 24 schools with the largest study body, Class B for the next 32 largest, Class C for the next 44 largest, and the remaining schools are classified Class D.
- Stakeholders. Those individuals who have a vested interest in the results of standardized testing and other school decisions (National Forum on Assessment, 1995). In this study, stakeholders will be parents, community members, teachers, students, and administrators.
- Standards-Based Reform. The concept of setting higher standards and measuring the attainment of those standards in uniform methods incorporating criterion-referenced tests (Wolf & White, 2000).
- Standardized Test. Any examination that is administered, and then scored in a predetermined, standardized fashion (Popham, 1999).
- Standards. A measure of comparison for qualitative or quantitative value (Morris, 1982).
- State Standards. A set of skills and/or concepts that policy makers have decided students need to know by a certain grade level.

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that respondents would be honest in reporting their perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact their school.
2. Nebraska state standards was a topic that would be of interest to the respondents.
3. Nebraska state standards was a topic in which school principals have some background knowledge.

Limitations

1. Because participation by school principals was voluntary, respondents may not have been representative of the overall population of Nebraska public high school principals.
2. Some respondents, particularly those new to their schools or to the position of principal, may not have had an adequate knowledge of the issues pertaining to Nebraska state standards in relation to their specific school to answer the survey questions effectively.

Delimitations

1. This study was delimited to public high school principals in the state of Nebraska.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study should be valuable to a variety of different groups. State policy makers in Nebraska will be able to examine the perceived effects this movement may have on schools before standards are fully implemented. Because

this survey was distributed after only the first leg of the state's assessment process, it provided a type of pre-assessment data for the entire state's standards-based reform movement. Furthermore, future studies will be able to confirm if these initial concerns were substantiated or not. In addition, this study may help highlight potential future roadblocks in the movement.

Nebraska universities offering administrative certificates, educational service units, and independent school districts may be forced to consider offering additional standards-based reform training for administrators to better equip them with this massive task of managing their schools' role in standards.

Prospective administrators will find the information valuable as it gives them additional insight into what they will be required to do and to deal with once in the position of building principal.

Building principals will be able to see how their colleagues perceive the issue. Finally, other states may take notice of how Nebraska's administrators perceive their standards. This is particularly worthy, considering that Nebraska's assessment process is so unique compared to the other 48 states implementing some form of the accountability movement (Roschewski et al., 2001).

Organization of the Study

Chapter 2 reviews the literature pertaining to (1) the background of standards from a historical and (2) state perspective and (3) their impact on school administrators. Chapter 3 discusses the procedures utilized in determining the impact standards will have for Nebraska school administrators. Chapter 4 presents the results of the study, while Chapter 5 discusses and interprets the results.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Understanding the various aspects of standards is critical for all who want to stay informed on current issues and trends in education. This review is divided into three main topics that deal with the standards reform movement. The first section deals with standards by investigating what a standard is, the history of the standards movement, and selected arguments raised by both advocates and opponents of standards. The second main topic pinpoints the standards movement in the state of Nebraska by investigating its past and looking towards the future. The third and last section reviews the factors that could potentially influence principals' perceptions of mandated standards. Within this part of the review, studies that attempt to explain whether or not standards truly impact student learning are presented along with literature that describes the impact standards have on schools and their administration.

Part I: Standards

Many people, even staunch supporters of standards, admit that there is a considerable amount of confusion about the idea of standards and what is meant when one talks about them (Houston, 2000; Noddings, 1997). Therefore, before the topic of standards can be addressed it is important to know what a standard is and to specify the different formats in which standards can be found.

The American Heritage Dictionary (Morris, 1982) defines a standard as "an acknowledged measure of comparison for quantitative or qualitative value" (p. 1256). Others envision standards to be something to rally around and still others see them as a description of various levels of proficiency (Noddings, 1997). Ravitch (1995a)

describes standards by categorizing them into the following categories: content standards, performance standards and opportunity to learn standards.

Content standards. Content standards clearly describe what a student should know and be able to do and what a teacher should be teaching at different points in a student's educational career. These particular types of standards should be measurable, understandable by teachers, parents, and students, and easily available to anyone who would want to read them (Marzano & Kendall, 1995; Nave et al., 2000; Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998). An example of a content standard for history could be, "The student will be able to use latitude and longitude to find coordinates of various cities".

Performance standards. Performance standards ask students to show that they meet content standards in a way that can be evaluated. This type of standard demonstrates for the student what the teacher is looking for in a given assignment. This process starts with the student being provided a concrete example of what type of work is expected by the evaluator (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998; Zmuda & Tomaino, 1999). Performance standards outline the degree of accuracy with which a student can recall facts and concepts in the form of an essay, test, simulation or oral report (Marzano & Kendall, 1995). An example of a performance standard for social studies could be, "The student will be able to find coordinates of cities using latitude and longitude at a 90% accuracy rate".

Opportunity to learn standards. Opportunity to learn standards have to do with the conditions and resources that students have in order to be given an equal chance to meet or exceed the performance standards (Lewis, 1995). Although this

topic is normally reserved for debate by the state and local government, it has proven to be very controversial at the federal level (Ravitch, 1995a). The central theme for "Opportunity to Learn Standards" is that if "high-stakes" assessments tied to promotion, graduation, and job placement are to be tied to standards, all students must have an equal chance to meet the performance standards (Lewis, 1995). For examples of schools in America that do not provide an adequate learning environment, one would need to look no further than the disheartening stories described in Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* (1991) or *Amazing Grace* (1996). Perhaps the topic of standards would be an easier one to discuss if the plethora of types of standards related to the field of education stopped here. It does not.

World class or higher standards. There are also world class, or world standards that are "based on the content presented to and the expectations held for students in other countries" (Lewis, 1995, p. 747). Articles written about world-class standards often describe the United States' shortcomings when compared to education systems in Japan, Korea, Switzerland, and other foreign countries (Resnick & Nolan, 1995a). Much like the world class standards, there are also higher standards. These are set to establish a high international educational system for America that compares favorably with other nations (Reigeluth, 1997).

Curriculum standards. Curriculum standards describe what should take place in the classroom and typically address instructional technique or recommended activities (Marzano & Kendall, 1995). Many states have published reports or frameworks that provide teachers with lessons that tie directly to their state's independent standards. In the modern age in which we live, many states and

organizations have gone to on-line resources for this type of information (PBS TeacherSource, 2000).

Power standards. Power standards have emerged as a strategy to deal with the tremendous number of content standards that some states have developed (Reeves, 2000). In fact, some believe that many of the existing standards that teachers are trying to cover will disappear because they are either not relevant or are too imprecise (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). In some cases, a district may narrow the state standards down to include only those that stand the test of time, have application to other courses being taught, and will provide a student with the skills and knowledge required to be successful at the next level. It is not uncommon to reduce the number of academic standards in a single grade level from 200 to 20 (Jones, 2000; Reeves, 2000).

Hire and certification standards. There are also hire standards set by business leaders to ensure that students have basic educational skills such as reading, writing, and computing. These standards illustrate that business leaders are interested in providing "job training but not basic skills education" (Reigeluth, 1997, p. 203). There are also certification standards, which deal with the minimum competencies required for a prospective educator to gain proper certification (Nave, et al., 2000). For example, in the state of Nebraska, all Nebraska teachers must take a special education course in order to obtain certification.

Summary. These differing definitions for standards directly relate to the varying reasons why people want standards in the first place. Many business leaders support a standard that will ensure that future employees are competent in basic

skills; some governmental leaders are concerned with improving United States test scores in comparison to other countries; many educators see standards as a way of making teaching more professional; and still others would like to see standards as a way of improving student achievement in the classroom (Reigeluth, 1997). With the various agendas, it is no wonder that this topic has become one of the hottest, and perhaps most confusing, items in education reform today (Lewis, 1995).

Standards Reform Movement

When studying this reform movement, it is also important to understand that many refer to the standards reform movement as the "standards/assessments/accountability" reform movement (Glickman, 2000/2001; Mackiel, 2000). Each of these three areas are interwoven and connected. Standards-based education begins with a formulation of performance standards and then moves to the development of statewide assessments based on these standards. The information generated from these tests tells the public what students have learned by comparing data to what they should have learned (Koerner & Elford, 1999). When schools are held accountable for their performance on this type of assessment, high-stakes testing is often the result (Domenech, 2000). This last phase of the standards movement has been described as the evil, more visible, and powerful sibling joined at the hip of standards and has, in some states, been tied to whether or not a student is allowed to advance a grade or graduate (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000; Thompson, 2001).

Other standards' authors have described the inter-connectivity of these three items but have added a fourth between the standards and assessment phase: The

common commercial textbooks and programs. These refer to the items that are expected to help teach the agreed-upon knowledge (Meier, 2000).

History of Standards

In determining the initiating event of the modern standards movement, there are many different places and/or events that have been cited. Some point to the publication of the report *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 (Bonstingl, 2001; Maher, 2001; Meier, 2000; Ravitch, 1995a), others look to President Bush's 1989 education summit (Hardy, 2000; Jennings, 1998; Olson, 2001; Stotsky, 2000), and still others have pointed to a National Education Association committee that was formed in the late nineteenth century (Mirel & Angus, 1994).

Committees to *Nation at Risk.* In 1892, the National Education Association appointed a committee to examine high school curriculum and make recommendations for improvement. This committee, which reflected perennialist ways of thought, was made up of influential people such as Commissioner W.T. Harris and Harvard President Charles W. Eliot. Much of their discussions revolved around the confusion over standards in secondary schools, curriculum issues, and the argument between "modernists" and "traditionalists". The final report of the Committee of Ten emphasized that high schools were for the elite and made no recommendations or special subjects for students who did not expect to go to college. Additionally, they concluded that curriculum standards needed to be high for every student and that every school should be taught in a standardized fashion (Gutek, 1988; Mirel & Angus, 1994; National Education Association, 1969).

The recommendations of The Committee of Ten were hotly debated by men like G. Stanley Hall who felt a uniform academic program inhibited students from exploring the world around them. Hall's sentiments and others were addressed in 1918 by another group commissioned by the National Education Association called the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Schools (Gutek, 1988). This group's work reflected the progressive way of thought by reorganizing the high school into instruments that supported social interaction and building values. Their aim was to educate all youths for "complete living" by providing a "comprehensive" school. All graduates, regardless of which track of educational standards they chose to take, would receive the same diploma (Gutek, 1988; Mirel & Angus, 1994).

These two different committees, the Committee of Ten and the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Schools, organized by the National Education Association laid the groundwork for future debate that still exists today. Should education have rigorous uniform standards as proposed by the Committee of Ten or should a curriculum that emphasizes students' individual needs as proposed by the Cardinal Principles be developed? At the heart of this issue lies a major part of the standards debate, individuality and flexibility or uniformity and rigidity in our nation's schools.

The proverbial pendulum has swung back and forth between societal movements that have supported one or the other committees' work for most of the twentieth century (Mirel & Angus, 1994). For instance, the 1930s, 1940s, late 1960s, and 1990s were marked by a time where a child-centered democratic philosophy reigned (Falk, 2000). The late 1950s, early 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, conversely, signified a return to a curriculum that demanded high educational standards and a

move towards getting "back to the basics" (Mirel & Angus, 1994). Each of the second group of decades marked a time period where the definition for excellence was detailed: the 1950s with mastery learning models, the 1960s with behavioral objectives, the 1970s with minimal competency standards, and the 1980s with outcomes (Stiggins, 2001). Future educational history books will certainly include the 2000s with this list when describing the standards/assessment/accountability reform.

Reaction to *A Nation at Risk.* While the various committees of decades ago laid the foundation for this longstanding American education debate, much has happened in recent years to add additional fodder. The standards movement, which could be considered to be in line with some of the recommendations of the Committee of Ten, gained major momentum in 1983 with the publication of the report entitled *A Nation at Risk* (Bonstingl, 2001; Maher, 2001; Meier, 2000; Ravitch, 1995a).

This report, which documented poor performance, low expectations and complacency among public schools in the United States, has often been cited as starting the modern public school reform movement. While much has been written to refute many of the negative claims found in the report (Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Horace Mann League, 1999), the plethora of negative statements about America's schools was enough to help generate the standards movement.

From the time of the publication of *A Nation at Risk* to 1989, many different people and events shaped the standards movement. First, in 1983 the California State Superintendent, Bill Honig, became the first state school chief in America to begin

work on revising a state's public school system. In the process, he called for the development of content standards and curriculum frameworks. Second, in 1987, the National Council of Teachers in Mathematics (NCTM) began to draft standards for curriculum and evaluation. This marked the first discipline to make efforts at creating a document that would prove to have a dramatic impact on an academic field. Third, despite successful efforts by schools to raise high school graduation rates and increase the number of students taking a minimum program (4 years of English, and 3 years of social studies, science and math), then-President George Bush proclaimed that changes in education were not coming fast enough (Jennings, 1998).

Governors' meeting. President Bush's sentiments were echoed by the nation's 50 governors during an education summit held in Charlottesville, Virginia in 1989 (Kendall & Marzano, 1997). The most significant accomplishment of this meeting was the formulation of six broad education goals that were set to be reached by the year 2000. These goals, commonly referred to as Goals 2000, provided the background for local initiatives such as Omaha 2000 and were:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in the modern economy.

4. U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

5. Every adult American will be literate and possess the knowledge and skills necessary in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

6. Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a safe, disciplined environment conducive to learning (National Education Goals Panel, 1998, p. vi).

Many individuals heard these goals announced for the first time during the 1990 Presidential State of the Union Address. Educators saw goals three and four as a strong suggestion from the government that some type of education standards would be needed. Questions such as, "How would challenging subject matter be defined without standards?", and "How would anyone know if the goals are met unless there is agreement on what needs to be learned?" were beginning to be asked (Ravitch, 1995a, p. 3).

The realization that standards would be needed raised even more questions such as, "How will they be set?, Who will set them?, Will they be voluntary?, and What role will the federal government play?" (Ravitch, 1995a, p. 58). The only question that was answered and represented a consensus between Bush and the governors was that any national standards and assessments would be voluntary. To evaluate the six goals and monitor the standards movement, various committees were put to work for the remainder of Bush's presidency (Ravitch, 1995a).

The 1990s. In 1990, the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) was established to monitor the progress of the six goals on a yearly basis. In addition, the committee members were asked to work with states at developing high academic standards and assessments (National Education Goals Panel, 1998).

In 1991, Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander asked Congress to set up the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST) that would advise law makers and educators on the desirability and feasibility of national standards and tests (Gagnon, 1995). In 1992, the council made the recommendation that high national standards tied to assessments were desirable. In addition, the report commented that council members had initially thought of standards only as a means of measuring progress towards the national goals, but later decided that standards were a means to actually achieving the goals (Jennings, 1998).

During 1992, the last year of Bush's presidency, the U.S. Department of Education supported the movement by making grants available to groups of scholars, teachers, and others interested in helping the development of voluntary national standards in science, history, geography, the arts, civics, English, and foreign languages. The reason that the subject of math was left out of the above list is because NCTM had already published Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics in 1989. Each selected group was awarded money and given the tremendous task of deciding what students should know in a given content area and at what stage of a student's schooling (Ravitch, 1995a).

The topic of standards remained a hot political topic during Bill Clinton's presidential term as well. During his administration, several changes to Bush's plan

were made including the Department of Education's Goals 2000, which were officially enacted into law in March of 1994. Goals 2000 added many changes to the structure of the standards movement. First, it formally authorized the already functioning National Educational Goals Panel. Second, it established the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), which was responsible for certifying voluntary national content and performance standards. Third, it established a grant program to enable states to design their own reform plan including content, performance, and opportunity to learn standards, and assessments. Fourth, it codified the national education laws and added two new goals to the six established by Bush and the 50 governors in 1989. The new goals dealt with access to programs for teachers and parental involvement (National Education Goals Panel, 1998; Ravitch, 1995a).

There are two other specific dates that illustrate the support that standards received during Clinton's administration. The first date deals with a National Education Summit that was held in March of 1996. State governors and business leaders from around the country expressed support for efforts to set clear academic standards in the core subject areas at the state and local levels. The business leaders pledged to aid in this movement by considering the existence of standards when locating facilities. In addition, the nation's governors added student assessment and accountability to the standard dialogue (Tucker & Codding, 1998). Later, in the 1997 State of the Union Address, President Clinton called for every state to adopt high national standards and stated that by 1999, every state should give fourth grade

students a test in reading and every eighth grader a test in math to make sure that the standards were being met (Kendall & Marzano, 1997).

Future of standards. President George W. Bush's future plans for education standards are quite clear. He plans to promote similar ideas and approaches that helped him accomplish goals he had set as governor of Texas through education reforms based on standards and testing. As president he promotes high standards, high expectations, and local accountability. Furthermore, Bush's feeling on the current state of standards and their interconnected parts became quite clear when he wrote that,

> Federal money will no longer flow to failure....If the scores are improving-making progress towards the state standards-a school will be rewarded with a grant and special recognition. If the disadvantaged children in a school are not making progress, the school will be warned that it is failing (Bush, 2000, p. 125).

The idea of standardized testing has also been a topic of debate in the United States House of Representatives. In a 255-173 vote on May 22nd, 2001, President Bush's plan to require annual testing of third through eighth graders was approved (ASCD, 2001).

Standards Debate

National, state, and local decision makers have been involved in the standards process and the reform continues. Differing viewpoints and arguments will be and have been brought forth. In fact, the word standards has been described as being a word that "is loaded with connotations-both positive and negative" (Umphrey, 1999,

p. 4). Of the literally hundreds of articles written about standards, an overwhelming majority of them center around the various authors' viewpoints on standards and why they should either be embraced, discarded, or modified. In this next section, a few of the most frequent arguments will be detailed in a point versus counterpoint fashion.

Standards provide equal opportunity. Many advocates of standards on the national, state and local level make the point that standards ensure that students in poor districts can have an education that is equal to students in more affluent areas. They say that standardized testing will dramatically reduce the inequities that exist between the curricula being offered in different communities or even within the same school (Hess & Brigham, 2000). Many believe that standards are the only way equity can become a reality, and that standards ensure that all students have the same educational experiences and opportunities regardless of their backgrounds (Noddings, 1997). In addition, with the advent of national standards and tests, underprivileged students can be compared to a standard and not to their more privileged counterparts (Resnick & Nolan, 1995b).

Proponents also contend that standards make it impossible for educators to say that the students in their school are unable to learn because of the environment in which they live. Standards and testing could illustrate and document growth for both wealthy and underprivileged communities. Without a system to measure growth of the students, it is believed that the public will confuse the benefits of being wealthy with the results of good teaching. In the past, teachers in poor schools have always been doomed to under performance because of the ability levels in which their students begin. Even though these students may make incredible gains, wealthy

schools are the ones given the benefit of being considered successful even though students come to them well-prepared and may not make as many gains as students in poor schools (Wolf & White, 2000).

Standards do not create equity. Critics fear that standards may create the illusion that everyone is on a level playing field when, in fact, this is not the case (Bohn & Sleeter, 2000; Noddings, 1997). They claim that national standards and assessments will not reduce the achievement gap of the "two nations" that exist in America's schools, but will widen it. Adoption of these programs will only confirm what these students already know about their past poor performance.

Merely stating that all children will perform "task A at level B" will do nothing. Furthermore, if policy makers adjust the standards and make them low enough for underprivileged students, they will be too easy for others. It is impossible to make standards that are uniformly challenging for all students (Reigeluth, 1997). Opponents can point to empirical studies to prove standardized testing does not "level the playing field". A 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress study found four variables (unrelated to instruction) that explained 89% of the variance in students' scores: number of parents living at home, type of community, parent's educational background, and state poverty rate (Robinson & Brandon, 1994). This type of data has caused some to feel that tests are only "an incredible measure of somebody's socioeconomic background" (Hardy, 2000, p. 4). In the words of outspoken standards critic Alfie Kohn (2001), "Don't let anyone tell you that standardized tests are not accurate measures. The truth of the matter is that they offer

a remarkably precise method for gauging the size of the houses near the school where the test is administered" (p. 349).

National curriculums have been successful. Another common area addressed by advocates is to mention that common national curriculums have worked in other counties around the world, so why not in America? In fact, research has shown us that many countries such as Japan, Sweden, Germany and France that have a national curriculum, have achieved a measure of academic excellence. This can be seen as good news for individuals working on standards because it shows that the possibility of setting high standards and expecting students to work to achieve them is possible (Resnick & Nolan, 1995a). It is this common curriculum and the high stakes of passing tough college entrance exams that make these systems work (Shanker, 1995). Furthermore, many would say we already do have a national curriculum. Because most school districts from around the country purchase textbooks from a handful of national publishers, most schools already teach similar curriculums (Lemann, 2000).

Schools should be locally run. Some could point to the U.S. Constitution and make the point that the U.S. Constitution did not establish a national education system because it was meant to be decided by state and local entities (Bauman, 1996). Many communities, schools and individuals believe that they know what is best for their children but believe, with standards, their state legislatures, who are unaware of their local concerns, have taken the power from their school boards and the communities they represent (Hardy, 2000).

The agency that typically determines standards may pose serious concerns regarding the amount of power parents want the state to have over their child's mind

and how long the standards will remain voluntary. There is a certain amount of fear in handing more control over to the government in an area as near and dear to people as education (Ravitch, 1995b). Hardy wrote, "Your children's future doesn't depend on you, your teachers, or the principal. It depends on some state official. I think that's a scary scenario for raising our children-scary, particularly in a democratic society" (p. 24).

Success of foreign countries. Even if the fear of losing control over local decisions exists, what do opponents say in response to the success the other countries are having? What about people who point out the fact that on 19 academic tests, American students were never first or second and were last seven times when being compared to similar industrial nations (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983)? What about stories in national publications that proclaim U.S. eighth graders as becoming little better than "C" students on a global curve in the area of math and science (Hoff, 2000)?

Impossible to compare different countries. In defense, critics bring up the point that it does not make sense to compare different nations in educational achievement when they all have different values for their children and different ways of testing. Making these types of comparisons without taking into account factors such as the different cultures, different allocations of time for teaching, or the different approaches to teaching makes it impossible to compare two cultures in student performance assessment (Eisner, 2001).

There are a plethora of examples of cultural beliefs that Americans hold for their children that other countries such as Japan do not share. For instance, the view

exists that American children should have a wide variety of experiences in activities such as athletics, piano lessons and other leisure pursuits. In addition, creativity, spontaneity and social interaction are encouraged for children by their American parents. No international studies have examined student creativity or any of the other values that are typically stressed in America and not in some of the competing countries (Berliner & Biddle, 1995).

Different factors associated with the administration of tests also make it difficult to compare international scores. For example, there is little mention of the fact that many foreign countries do not test students who are not well versed in their countries' native language. Study samples from America usually include students who do and do not speak fluent English (Berliner & Biddle, 1995). In addition, many countries in the world assume that only 20 to 25% of students will go to college; therefore, they are the only students who are tested. In the United States, it is assumed that everyone has the right to go to college; therefore, more students are tested (Romberg, 1993). Last, it is impossible to compare the United States' test scores as a whole considering there are so many different governing bodies. For instance, Louisiana ranks low when compared to most countries in certain categories while Nebraska and Iowa rank high. Some believe it is inaccurate to place all of the states into one group when comparing data (Berliner, 2001). It is believed that all of these factors contribute to lower American scores and misleading statistics.

Professional atmosphere standards create. Supporters of standards and their testing believe that criterion and norm-referenced testing provide an atmosphere of professional business-like accountability for administrators and teachers and clear

direction for students and their parents. They would also suggest that this promotes open dialogue and understanding among all of the stakeholders, which is an invaluable component to student learning and standards-based instruction. For example, one instructor wrote that students are able to refer specifically to the various standards they do not meet and ask how they can improve in that content area (Zmuda & Tomaino, 1999).

Other advantages seen by proponents. There are also many other advantages to the current testing movement. First, tests can serve the role of determining a student's strengths and weaknesses in a very efficient manner. The tests provide a clear picture of how well a student or school is doing and are an accurate way to determine various rewards and sanctions for those who fail to perform favorably. Tests hold schools accountable (Lemann, 2000). Second, criterion and norm referenced testing have been utilized in American schools since the 1920s and have been effective tools for educators (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Third, the testing format is fairly inexpensive compared with some of the other educational reforms that have been proposed in the past (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000). Fourth, creating high expectations for every student lets students and parents know that someone believes in the students' ability to succeed (Nave et al., 2000).

How Tests are Used

Opponents have stated that the question of how these tests are being used and interpreted is a major obstacle that threatens to undermine the whole standards movement (Domenech, 2000). While testing may provide a business-like accountability system, no state's tests are 100% accurate, which makes it difficult to

tie high-stakes to one test. Critics often point to three specific reasons why tests should not be used in a high-stakes manner.

Three major problems with tests. First, "test developers are obligated to create a series of one-size-fits-all assessments" (Popham, 1999, p. 11). Even though test developers do attempt to find as many items as possible to test students' skills in various areas, there will always be many items that are not in line with what the students were taught in their classroom. For example, there are times where nearly 50% of the test items are not even taught, or supposed to be taught, in a given classroom (Popham, 2000). Other studies have concluded that as much as 50-80% of what is measured on a standardized test is not adequately addressed in the textbooks assigned to the students taking the test (Freeman et al., 1983).

Second, because the goal of standardized tests is to create a large spread in scores for the purpose of evaluation, test items that students score well on are thrown out by the test makers. Items that teachers find the most important to teach tend to be discarded because students know the material (Popham, 1999; 2000). Unfortunately, the goal of a test is not used solely to test what students know; part of the goal is to make sure that there are differences. Not all students can be above average. Half of the students have to be below average or it's not a norm-referenced test (Knowles & Knowles, 2001).

Third, tests typically have questions that could be divided into three categories: things taught in school, items linked to socioeconomic status, and those that can be answered by using inherited abilities. With this in mind, schools have

some influence over test scores, but not enough for the sanctions that are currently in place (Popham, 2000).

One test should not be sole basis. A federal report by the "Standards for Educational Psychological Testing" made up of individuals from the American Psychological Association, the National Council on Measurement in Education, and the American Educational Research Association has asserted that decisions affecting a student's future should not be made on the sole basis of one test (American Educational Research Association, 1999). Even leading test publishers agree with this claim by indicating that their tests are not perfect measures (Domenech, 2000). Opponents would argue that standardized test scores should only be regarded as rough estimates that help students, parents, and educators make comparative interpretations (Popham, 1999). In addition, opponents also make the claim that using one "high-stakes" test has had many other unplanned negative effects that range from educators cheating on the test, to students experiencing fear, to schools focusing solely on teaching to the test.

Pressure for educators exists with standards. When state education chiefs and their boards create a ranking system for schools and offer other high stakes sanctions, the pressure to succeed and raise scores is tremendous. As is the case in sporting events in similar pressure filled scenarios, cheating takes place. In the year 2000, there were multiple incidents of teachers and administrators cheating in order to receive high scores. Cheating can range from distributing copies of the actual test weeks prior to their administration date to actually changing students' wrong answers to correct ones. Various school officials across the nation have been placed on

probation or fired for this practice (Clarke, 2000; Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Wallace, 2000). Other school officials and teachers have responded to this pressure by refusing to administer the tests (Ohanian, 2001).

Pressure for students exists with standards. While some educators have responded to this by cheating, students have been known to respond negatively as well. "The most telling educational argument against high-stakes testing comes from the cognitive scientists who point out that fear inhibits learning" (Houston, 2000, p. 58). When high-stakes such as whether or not a student will graduate are put on one 2-hour test, students are certainly going to feel a sense of fear and emotional stress. Emotionally stressful school environments are counterproductive in the fact that they inhibit the ability for student learning (Sylwester, 1995).

Students who feel stress from the impact of what one test can do to their life are very likely to experience "downshifting". This is a term used to describe a defense mechanism where a student will experience a sense of helplessness or fatigue and just shut down (Abbott, 1997; Pool, 1997). Critics would contend that it is not right to have high-stakes testing for students who experience this phenomenon. In fact, there is a strong negative correlation between having a mandatory graduation test and having a greater than national average of students reaching the proficient level or higher (Neill, 1998).

Impact on classroom activities. Testing also influences what teachers are doing in their classrooms. Many believe testing has had a major impact on what actually takes place in the classroom because scores on standardized tests often reflect memorization more than the ability to think and use information (Caine & Caine,

1998; Main, 2000). Teachers are not encouraged to practice various educationally sound concepts that have been proven effective for classrooms (Gardner, 1994; Goleman, 1998). Some critics have gone as far as to say that the intellectual life has left our schools as they have become what are, essentially, giant test-prep centers (Kohn, 2001).

Cognitive scientists have made discoveries in recent years that support the critics' beliefs that having schools shift their focus away from higher order thinking is not benefiting students. Due to recent advances in technology, scientists have been able to examine brain scans to determine that using higher order thinking skills engages a person's frontal lobe. Using this part of the brain enables learners to make connections to what they have learned in the past by making recall of information and concepts more efficient. Rote learning on the other hand, which is emphasized on standardized tests, is typically stored just long enough for the student to take the test (Sousa, 1998).

Furthermore, research has been conducted on all levels of K-12 education that illustrates that high scores on standardized tests support teaching to lower level thinking skills. In a study that examined elementary students who took the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), it was found that students who just copied down answers, guessed a lot and skipped through the hard part scored higher than students who were more actively engaged (Meece, et al., 1988). Middle school students taking the CTBS who value literacy activities scored lower than those who do not (Anderman, 1992). High school students taking the SAT who just tried to get high grades while taking no

interest in what they actually learned scored higher than those who valued deep understanding of the subject matter (Hall et al., 1995).

Whether or not a person sides with the proponents or the opponents of the standards-reform movement, there are certainly numerous arguments to consider. These topics and others have found their way into the discussions of individuals and groups in the state of Nebraska.

State Level

> America is one of the few nations in which responsibility for schools is not under the aegis of a national ministry of education. Although we have a federal agency, the U.S. Department of Education, the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution indicates that those responsibilities that the Constitution does not assign explicitly to the federal government belong to the states (or to the people). And since the Constitution makes no mention of education, it is a responsibility of the states. As a result, we have 50 departments of education, one for each state (Eisner, 2001, p. 367).

Because there are 50 separate departments of education across the United States, one might expect to find an even mix between those that have a form of education standards and those that do not. However, this is not so, as state school chiefs have been extremely willing, responsive and supportive of the national standards movement. This acceptance is likely due to the fact that standards have been handled in a very non-mandatory and volunteer fashion (O'Neil, 1995).

As of 2002, every state, with the exception of Iowa, has produced statewide academic standards for what students should be able to do in some subjects. All 50

states test to see how well students are learning, 27 states have a form of "high-stakes testing" by holding schools accountable for results, and 45 states compile state report cards on schools (Olson, 2001). Where does Nebraska fit into this national trend? The history of Nebraska's standards and where the movement is going in the future is presented in the second major portion of this review.

L.E.A.R.N.S. report. In 1995, the State Department of Education began sponsoring task forces, focus groups, town hall meetings and other forums to discuss all aspects of state standards. By August 24, 1998, the Nebraska State Board of Education finished reviewing the task force drafts of the standards and displayed the results of its work. A standards listing titled, *Nebraska: L.E.A.R.N.S.* (1998), was published in a special edition of every major newspaper across the state of Nebraska. The contents of this document listed all of the newly adopted state content standards for the academic discipline areas of math, science, reading, writing and social studies/history and displayed them in a manner that showed what all students should know by the end of first, fourth, eighth and twelfth grades. The adoption of these standards was intended to be entirely voluntary (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).

Nebraska State Superintendent, Dr. Doug Christensen, expressed to the state school districts how these standards would affect them in a presentation that was available across the state the following fall. In this, he addressed *L.E.A.R.N.S.*' purpose, why the state standards were adopted by Nebraska, and how assessment will be used with the standards (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).

Dr. Christensen stated that the document *L.E.A.R.N.S.* was formatted for three specific purposes. First, standards are basically a policy statement about learning because providing guidance to local school boards about policy statements is the state school board's responsibility. The guidance in this case is provided in the document that listed the state standards. Second, *L.E.A.R.N.S.* provides a tool for planning, working together and making teaching and learning better. It was stressed that Nebraska schools were doing a good job, but that the goal was to become the best in the country. Third, *L.E.A.R.N.S.* encourages community wide discussions about what teachers should teach and what students should learn (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).

The state school chief believed that *L.E.A.R.N.S.* and its standards would make Nebraska's school systems among the best, prepare students for the future whether that future included continued education or the world of work, and enable districts and the state to determine what is being taught and what is being learned. This, in turn, would allow for schools to aim at a desired outcome, make an assessment and then finally evaluate success. Having clear priorities would help schools focus on the essential things such as quality instruction. Dr. Christensen further stated that quality education could benefit by using a set of standards to serve as a guidepost. Effective teaching should no longer be evaluated by what the teacher does in the classroom but by how well the students do on assessments. Dr. Christensen saw adopting standards as a process that begins to change everything (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).

1998-present. The original plan was for standards to be voluntary, with an assessment process that would eventually be decided on and worked out by the state board of education. Some of the original ideas mentioned included using existing tests and rating schools on their performance, then using an auditing system through which a district would audit the classrooms; the state would, in turn, audit the district. The plan further stated that by the 1999-2000 school year, an audit system would become mandatory. Then by 2000, the first annual state of schools report would be published, which would contain student achievement information, system performance and a school improvement plan. A ratings system would likely accompany this report (Nebraska State Department of Education, 1998).

Also in 1998, the Nebraska State Legislature passed Legislative Bill 1228 which mandated that there would be one state test given in all districts by the fall of 2000. According to a standards expert in the metropolitan area, many educators were against this bill. First, many maintained that if the standards are voluntary, but the assessment of the standards is not, does that not make the standards mandatory? Second, in 1999, the Nebraska legislature authorized $1.8 million to be spent to create a statewide test. Many experts believed the state legislature was unfamiliar with the costs of this massive undertaking. By comparison, similar tests devised by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for other states have cost over 12 million dollars. Many wondered if a viable test could be devised on this low budget (A. Trinkle, personal communication, February 12, 2000).

In 1999, the Nebraska State Department's focus became less on a statewide test and more on a statewide system. This made Nebraska and Iowa the only states

without a statewide testing system for measuring student achievement and performance. The only exception to this is that Nebraska began administering one test for writing in grades 4, 8, and 11 in the spring of 2001. The 1.8 million dollars, previously reserved for the development of a statewide test, has since been allocated for the S.T.A.R.S. (School based Teacher-led Assessment and Reporting System) grant (Reid, 2001).

During the 1999-2000 school year, individual school districts continued working closely with the state standards. Some latitude had been given to individual schools in a couple of different ways. While many states required only results on norm-referenced tests to serve as the lone assessment tool, each school in Nebraska was given the opportunity of measuring its standards by methods other than norm-referenced testing. Although Rule 10 does require school systems to select and give some sort of norm-referenced test, school districts could intertwine their own methods of evaluation if they met certain requirements. The S.T.A.R.S. document published by the Nebraska State Department of Education dictated what those requirements were. There were six:

1. the assessments reflect the state or local standards,
2. students have an opportunity to learn the content,
3. the assessments are free from bias,
4. the level is appropriate for students,
5. there is consistency in scoring, and
6. mastery levels are appropriate

(Nebraska State Department of Education, 2000, p. 4.1).

Notice that in number one, schools are given a choice of having assessments reflect the state standards or their own. This became acceptable in 1998 when the Nebraska Department of Education gave school districts the choice of either adopting the state standards or their own (Reid, 2001). This fact will likely make it into Rule 10's next copy. In the working draft of Rule 10 from October 20, 2000, it was written that: "By July 1, 2003, each school system adopts the state standards for reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, and history....or has local content standards that are the same as, equal to, or exceeding in rigor to the state standards" (p. 6).

While districts have until 2003 to accomplish this, many have applied for and received approval from the State Board of Education for district standards or objectives that meet or exceed the state standards. Many smaller districts continue to use the state standards, but other districts are creating their own standards and submitting them for approval to the state education department (Reid, 2001). For instance, the Bellevue Public Schools, with a little over 9,000 students formed essential objectives, which exceed the state standards. Therefore, part of their district's evaluation consists of teachers marking the objectives that a student meets when a certain skill or objective is accomplished (A. Trinkle, personal communication, January 20, 2001). For comparison, Freeman Public Schools with a little over 300 students is in the process of writing their own standards. While many were borrowed from the state standards, a few modifications have been made. Ultimately, a computer program will enable teachers in the district to give a student a

grade, then double click to a listing of the objectives to determine which ones the student has met (T. Brazell, personal communication, February 8, 2001).

In the spring of 2000, support for S.T.A.R.S. and Nebraska's assessment strategies were found in the Nebraska legislature when Legislative Bill 812 was passed. The bill calls for districts to perform three specific tasks: 1) adopt the state's standards or those that exceed the state's, 2) report annually on the success of students on the standards, and 3) participate in a statewide writing assessment (Roschewski et al., 2001).

Because of Legislative Bill 812, each district was required in September of 2000 to show what standards they were meeting and how they were measuring them. These data were then compiled and used in the fall of 2000 for Nebraska's first state report card. In this report, there were no individual districts identified. The report included an aggregate of state information including student achievement data such as percentage of Nebraska students in the first, second, third, and fourth quartile in the areas of reading and mathematics. Other data included items such as ACT scores, student enrollment and graduation rates (Nebraska State Department of Education, 2000). While the state department did not list individual school's scores in the aforementioned areas, the state's largest newspaper, the Omaha World-Herald, did.

In the spring of 2001, English became the first discipline area to be tested with the emphasis being on reading/writing assessment for fourth, eighth, and eleventh grade students. In the spring, students had 30 minutes (35 for fourth grade) to complete a rough draft essay on the first day and the same amount of time on day two to complete their final copy. The topic from which the students wrote was not

presented to the students until the first day of the test. The essays were scored by a select group of English teachers throughout the state who utilized a consistent grading policy, the 6-trait writing method (Bellevue Board of Education, 2001).

In May of 2001, the Nebraska State Department of Education provided individual school districts with the results of the state writing test. The summary of the report was divided into three parts:

1. district summary by grade level,
2. score distribution by building and grade level, and
3. building grade level score distribution report by student (Nebraska State Department of Education, 2001, 1.1-1.2).

Because this test was considered a pilot, these scores were not be used for any official reporting by the state department. While the *Omaha World Herald* issued an overall view of how the state as a whole did on the statewide test, no individual reporting of districts or schools was planned to take place (Matczak, 2001). However, many believed that the Omaha World Herald would eventually complete this task during the summer or fall of 2001. This prediction became reality on August 2, 2001 when each district in the state had its writing scores published in the *Omaha World-Herald* (Matczak & Goodsell, 2001). Comparisons among schools from within districts became available through reports in other papers at a later date (Grayson, 2001).

The Future of standards in Nebraska. While planning for the English/writing test began in the fall of 2000, further testing will continue in each subsequent year. It was initially planned for testing that math and writing would be in the spring of 2001, Social Studies and writing in 2002, and Science and writing in 2003. This has since

changed to Language Arts in 2003, math in 2004, Science in 2005, and Social Studies in 2006. While the writing assessment will remain a norm-referenced test, plans for testing in each of the other areas have been different for each school district. Some districts have designed assessments that resemble the state standards, while others have planned on assessments such as portfolios, classroom samples, and other tests. The Buros Institute in Lincoln, Nebraska, will evaluate each district's assessments (Reid, 2001; Roschewski et al., 2001).

By November of 2001, the state's report changed. In a state of our schools report, it was said that individual districts and schools would be categorized. This report provided various types of data for each school and gave schools a rating ranging from "excellent" to "unacceptable". The types of items that were graded include the types of assessment plans, the percentage of students that meet the standard, success with groups of students who do not typically do well in school, and improvement. School districts received a "school performance rating" based on how they score on the multiple criteria. This enabled schools to see how individual school scores compared to the state aggregate. While no "high-stakes" were tied to these reports, many believed that community pressure and pride in the district would promote high scores and accountability (Reid, 2001; Roschewski et al., 2001).

In preparation for the report in the fall of 2001, school districts developed portfolios in the summer of 2001, which described how the district had met the six quality criteria far assessment during the 2000-2001 school year. The portfolios, which are due to the state on June 30, 2001, contained a collection of local assessment materials such as copies of tests and lesson plans. These materials were

then used for the external review and rating (Nebraska Department of Education, 2001).

While Nebraska is just beginning to implement its standards/assessment/accountability process, many will be looking to see what impact standards will have on Nebraska. Nebraska, which is the 49th state to adopt an assessment system, has had the opportunity to watch other states' mistakes and successes while developing its own accountability system (Roschewski et al., 2001). Will this unique plan improve student learning? Will it provide unhealthy environments for students and educators? These and other questions will be answered with time. However, whatever the answers to these questions are, administrators will certainly play a key role in the process.

Impact on Schools

When considering the implications that standards have for schools from an administrator's viewpoint, the first question that could be asked is, will they impact student learning (Mathers, 2001)? The verdict is still out when trying to answer this question. Some critics point to the success that their individual states, districts, schools, and classrooms are having while others contend that little research has been conducted that definitely links the two variables.

Student learning at a state level. On a state level, achievement scores of students are said to be increasing in some states including Texas, North Carolina, and Kentucky (Porter, 2000). Specifically, Texas reported that from 1994 to 1999, schools that were recognized as either exemplary or above average soared from 14% to 48% of schools in the state. From 1995 to 1999, schools in the unacceptable range

went from 14% to 1% (Bracey, 2000). Virginia began incorporating the new "Standards of Learning" in June of 1995. This state maintained that some of the improvements made since standardizing include: improvement in 93% of schools administering the fifth grade writing test, 85% of schools administering the Algebra I test, and 90% of schools administering the Algebra II test.

Student learning at a district level. Districts have also reported success. For instance, Los Angeles Unified School District reported that from 1998 to 1999, the year the district began implementing their current standards movement, 64% of their 660 schools improved on their norm-referenced tests (Los Angeles Unified School District, 1998). Chicago, with over 431,000 students, has seen scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills increase for 4 straight years after implementing a tough standards reform (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000). Frederick County, Maryland, incorporated a standards movement and went from a middle tier state school to a top tier school (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). Lake Havasu, Arizona, was able to raise the percentage of students reading at grade level from 20% to 30% (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). Brazosport, Texas, near Houston, has 90% of its students achieve at or above the 90% proficiency rating after focusing on a curriculum aimed at raising test scores (Schmoker, 2000)

Student learning at a school level. Waitz Elementary School in Texas also focused on making sure students passed the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills and saw dramatic increases. While a 70% marks the state's passing score, the students' scores averaged only 41.2% in 1993. However, in 1998, the average score was 97.3%. Similar gains were found in other academic areas as well (Cawelti,

2000). Another elementary school, this one in Inglewood, California, found tremendous gains when focusing on standards. Despite having 78% of its students coming from low-income families, the school raised its school-wide reading performance from the 3rd percentile to the 15th in only one year (Schmoker, 2000).

Student learning at a classroom level. While many contend that standards-based reforms improve student achievement, little research has been conducted that definitely links the two variables. In fact, an article in *Phi Delta Kappan* states that there is only one such study with a small sample size consisting of one teacher, three classes of students, and one school (Nave et al., 2000). In this study that set out to examine student motivation and achievement in an earth science class, the teacher held students accountable for high academic standards. The students in the class were informed that they had to achieve a perfect score on the unit test and would continue working until they did so. If they did not accomplish this on the first attempt, they would find time in study hall, during the lunch hour or other times to receive help from the teacher or a peer. In the end, all but one of the 72 students were able to accomplish the perfect score (Allen & Dietrich, 1991). While this study is small, it does provide a glimpse of what is intended by the standards movement.

Opponents' view on standards. Whether or not these studies show that standards impact student learning is debatable. As has been consistent with this literature review of standards, nothing appears to be black and white, and much is considered gray. Those who support standards would point to the studies and say that students are obviously learning and that, yes, the system is working. However, others would say this only illustrates that teachers prepared students to take the test.

Opponents have questioned how schools have gone about making these improvements. For example, if a school received numerous low testing scores, a principal and the teachers would likely feel pressure to raise scores quickly. They may take measures, such as increasing the amount of time they spend on test preparation workbooks, emphasizing the tested items, allowing more time for classroom practice tests, and providing more staff development activities aimed at raising the test scores. While a school may raise its scores over time, critics would say that it did nothing to improve the quality of the learning process; therefore, whether or not student learning was affected was not determined (McColskey & McMunn, 2000).

Implications of Standards

While the results and interpretations of these studies are certainly left for the reader to decipher, there is little doubt that the on-going research will help influence principals' perceptions of how state standards will impact their respective schools. There are many possible implications that principals must consider when their state and district are adopting standards, ranging from the manner in which staff development operates to managing the stress and reactions of teachers coping with change. Unfortunately, the literature on principal perceptions on the impact of standards is extremely limited. In fact, searches on electronic databases such as ERIC, First Search, and Dissertation Abstracts International found literally thousands of articles that related to education standards but only a very small handful that addressed the specific topic of principals' perceptions of state standards and their impact in their schools. Much of the following research was found in various articles

and books that dealt with how schools could successfully implement a standards-based reform.

Teacher training plays an important role. If teachers are to be expected to understand standards and how they will affect their classroom instruction and assessment practices, adequate training is crucial and needed (Angaran, 1999; Falk, 2000). Currently, many teachers have never even seen their state's new standards, been trained to teach the courses differently, or been taught to analyze test data and use the results to formulate meaningful goals for students (Angaran, 1999; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000). With this huge deficit that exists between implementing and understanding the process, the type of staff development needed is not just a 1 to 2 hour in-service. Teachers need 40 or more hours of training in order to change the way in which they teach (Angaran, 1999).

> Standards-based reform in high schools is changing curriculum, instruction, and assessment, sometimes drastically. It is unrealistic to expect that individual teachers will somehow be able to make sense of the numerous national and state content standards without unprecedented support through comprehensive professional development (Hirsch, 1999, p. 31).

Other teacher tasks are required. While teachers will likely spend a great deal of time in staff development learning to use standards, many writers contend that teacher's services will be needed in other places as well. In fact, a typical teacher can expect to spend as much as one third of his/her professional career working with assessment related activities (Stiggins, 2001). Much of the literature describes what part teachers should play in the process by indicating that they should align

curriculum to student standards (Berman et al., 2000; Bezy, 1999; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000; McColskey & McMunn, 2000), develop fair assessments to measure achievement of the standards (Berman et al., 2000), create standards-compatible instructional activities (Bezy, 1999), develop practice tests (Bezy, 1999), work as a full faculty to conduct a review of the assessment results at the end of the year (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999), learn to administer the tests (Harrington-Lueker, 2000) and form teams to identify areas of strengths, weaknesses, and clarity on various issues (McColskey & McMunn, 2000; Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). Since most teachers teach a full course load, many wonder when the time to perform these tasks will be made available.

Resource concerns due to standards. The answer to this question may be by paying teachers in the summer or after school to perform these duties (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). This creates a problem, as the standards-based reform movement has been an unfunded mandate brought about by state governments. Besides personnel costs, there are many other expenses to consider. Offerings such as the after-school Lighthouse Program in Chicago, summer schools, and "academic test-prep" centers, are all incredibly costly (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000). In addition, because school boards can only fund a limited number of staffing positions and programs, difficult decisions will have to be made. For instance, there may be less money available for teachers of subjects whose curriculum is not addressed on standards or their tests. This could mean lean times for programs such as art, physical education, and family and consumer science (Bezy, 1999; Lockwood, 1998). This concern is being realized in Boston, Massachusetts, where physical education

instructors have blamed the budget constraints linked to standards on making their programs little more than token gestures (Coleman, 2001). Paid in-service, additional tasks performed by teachers, special programs, and a focused core education could all prove to have major implications for administrators.

Leader/principal is often untrained. While teachers are performing these various tasks, they will often look to the principal for guidance. This is certainly nothing new for school principals as when anything occurs in a school, all heads turn towards the office (Lashway, 2000). Unfortunately, in this case, an answer or response may not be adequate as very few administration programs across the country train school administrators on the finer points of the standardized testing process. In fact, little work has been put in place for principals to develop the skills needed for this responsibility, and generations of administrators may lack any training at all in assessment practices. Currently, only three states require assessment competency as a requirement of earning an administrative endorsement (King & Bunce, 1999; Stiggins, 2001).

Therefore, few administrators are typically knowledgeable about crucial aspects of the standards/assessment/accountability process, including areas such as administering the test correctly, reading the scores, helping teachers become assessment literate, leading teachers in realigning local curriculum to state standards, arranging appropriate staff development activities, understanding the kind of environment that promotes student achievement, and providing the right kind of leadership (Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Lashway, 2000; Stiggins, 2001). Other areas

are also noted as being critical components for administrators to maintain in this movement are communicating with the public and managing the change process.

Communication's role in standards. Communication is crucial in standards reform. Everybody, including students, parents, teachers, and business leaders, need to know what the standards are and why they are so important (Jones, 2000; Lockwood, 1998; Stiggins, 2001). Reporting to the public is perhaps most important once the results of a test are in. School leaders must be familiar with their ratings and scores and able to explain what they mean to community members. At this crucial time, it is imperative for principals to be able to explain the meaning of the school's rating, whether the scores are high or low (Johnson et al., 2000). Schools and their principals must respond when scores are made available to the public, not only to the community with an action plan but also to the classroom with instructional plans (Stiggins, 2001).

Managing the change process. Perhaps the biggest challenge that principals face in the standards-reform is managing teachers in the change process. Teaching in a standards environment will significantly change the way in which teachers operate. Historically, teachers, perhaps more than any other occupation, typically have worked in isolation from others. They have incredible freedom (Weiss, Cambone & Wyeth, 1992). However, in a standards-based environment, individual teacher's freedom will be limited in matters such as selecting the curriculum (Angaran, 1999). State policy makers will already decide the curriculum.

Small schools have a unique challenge. While there are numerous potential stressors named in the above paragraphs for school principals, those working in a

small environment face even more issues. First, implementing standards is a substantial drain on a small school's faculty since they are already teaching multiple assignments with many preparations. Second, standards will be a substantial drain on what is often an already depleted budget. Third, most small districts do not have positions such as Director of Assessment or other paid consultants who help with the tasks associated with standards, such as validating tests and organizing teachers to align the standards with the curriculum. This task will often be given to the building principal to organize. While many of these issues also emerge in large school districts, they may be even more profound in smaller communities (Harmon & Branham, 1999).

Problems with mandated change. Mandated changes often leave frustrated and angry teachers in their wake (Page & Marlowe, 2000). While many teachers will fight standards-reform, principals will have an incredible task of providing their schools with the three phases of the standards' change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization (Hirsch, 1999). At each of these phases, principals will have to deal with those teachers who just do not want to change anything because they are comfortable with the old, or maybe in the middle of a mid-life crisis or burnout, or may be the type of individuals who will always maintain consistent patterns of negative behavior even while everyone around them is changing (Evans, 1996; Huberman, 1988; Monroe, Borzi, & Dissolvo, 1990). Additionally, it is not uncommon for teachers to simply allow surface changes or find subversive ways of challenging the reform when they do not see a need for change (Page & Marlowe, 2000). Regardless of these possible reactions, change requires the

creation of a new system, which always demands leadership. The school principal will be required to make standards work, even if the staff may not see that a change is needed (Kotter, 1995).

Factors that can influence leaders' perceptions. The ways in which principals themselves perceive change and their role as a leader can be influenced by many factors. Comparisons regarding the characteristics of leaders that are commonly documented include those in the area of gender, age, and years as a leader.

The literature on gender differences between male and female leaders is not clear-cut. Some studies cite no differences while others have found many (Powell, 1993; Shakeshaft, 1989). Some common themes have emerged among the authors who have cited differences in leadership style between the two genders. Examples include:

- women tend to excel more than men in the area of interpersonal communication,
- women are more likely than men to use democratic decision making and cooperative planning strategies, and
- women are less comfortable than men with ambiguous situations (Helgesen, 1990; Powell, 1993; Shakeshaft, 1989).

The age of a leader may also influence his/her perceptions of a change. In fact, literature claims that the era in which one becomes acclimated into his/her respective career influences his/her perceptions. Because "people cannot avoid the influence of the times in which they live", it is important to note that the age of a

leader will play a role in formulating ideas, thoughts, and feelings about certain issues (Evans, 1996, p.112).

On a related topic, the amount of socialization one has had in his/her present position can also play a major role on perceptions. Evans (1996) wrote that a person's career can generally be divided into three categories: entry, mid-career, and exit. Professionals in each of these areas typically display similar tendencies ranging from initiation to feeling established to progressive disengagement. Similarly, Buchanan (1974) analyzed the literature and stated that a manager's career can also be divided into three stages: the first year, the second through fourth year, and the fifth year and beyond. Stage one is categorized by simply becoming initiated into the job, stage two as a time to make a mark of achievement, and stage three as a time where organizational attitudes have become more mature. Berlew and Hall (1966) have also written about the stages one enters, leaves, and transitions into while being a leader. Their research focuses on the fact that a leader's first 6 to 18 months is extremely critical for future success.

When analyzing a major change among a large heterogeneous group of people, it is important to take factors such as gender, age, and years as a leader into consideration. As the research indicates, all of these areas can influence a person's perceptions of change.

Principals' perceptions of standard's change. While there is a great deal of literature on standards and research on how change impacts organizations, people, and perceptions, there is very little evidence that links the topics together. A select few, however, do exist.

In 1981, a pair of doctoral dissertations sought to measure administrator perceptions of the then popular minimal competency standards movement of the early 1980s (Harris; Johnson). Bacon (1999) later investigated student perceptions of Colorado's state standards movement. Duke, Tucker, and Heineke (2000) surveyed high school principal perceptions of how Virginia's state standards would impact their schools.

Each of the aforementioned studies were certainly important in their time; however, none looked at one large sample of an entire state's high school principals. For example, Harris and Johnson surveyed all different types of administrators including district and building level from only a given region of their respective states. Bacon focused on a select group of students. Duke, Tucker, and Heineke narrowed their study to high school principals but only included a very small portion as only 16 completed the survey.

Of all the research on standards, change, and perceptions, no study has set out to examine how their state's standards/assessment/accountability movement is perceived by an entire state's principals at any level. This is a niche in the growing area of education research that has gone, until now, virtually untapped.

Summary

The prevailing theme in much of this review of the research is that there is a great deal of confusion and opinions when it comes to studying the standards/assessment/accountability reform movement. However, due to Rule 10, Legislative Bill 1228, Legislative Bill 812, and decisions made by the Nebraska Department of Education and its governing body, Nebraska school administrators,

despite little or no training, will be asked to lead their schools through this movement. Resulting activities will mark a considerable change in the operating procedure that has existed for decades in this state for all members of a school's staff. How do principals' perceive this change will impact their schools? This study will address this question through the methods presented in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3

Methods

Research Design

A survey was used to generate quantitative data describing principals' perceptions of the state standards movement which was then analyzed to quantitative data to discover relationships between variables. Specifically, a cross-sectional approach was incorporated in order to gain an understanding of a particular phenomenon at a particular time (Best & Kahn, 1993). In this case, the phenomenon was principal perceptions of state standards, and the time was the fall of 2001.

Sample

The population considered to be relevant to this study consisted of all individuals with the title of principal in secondary public high schools in the State of Nebraska. High schools in Nebraska are typically considered to be in one of four classes based on enrollment: A, B, C, or D, with A representing the largest and D the smallest (NSAA Bulletin, 2001). The 24 schools with the highest enrollments are considered Class A, the next 32 largest are Class B, the next 44 largest are Class C, and the remaining schools are Class D. According to the Nebraska State Department of Education, there are 305 total schools in the state of Nebraska. Private and alternative schools were eliminated, leaving a grand total of 293 school principals as the sample for this study.

Data Collection

In August of every year, a large majority of the State's high school principals attend Administrator Days in Kearney, Nebraska, sponsored by the Nebraska Council

of School Administrators. With many of the study's participants in Kearney for this conference, the survey was made available on-site near the registration table. A sign that requested high school principals to stop at the desk helped generate 28 completed surveys before a mailing was done after the conference.

On August 4th, a survey packet was mailed to the remaining public high school principals in the State of Nebraska who did not complete a survey in Kearney. The information included (a) a cover letter containing a brief explanation of the study and instructions, (b) a Likert-survey (see Appendix A), and (c) a return check-off card. The return check-off card helped to maintain anonymity since participants were asked to mail a separate postcard back to the researcher in order to determine who had and who had not completed the survey.

The conference and first mailing generated 205 surveys, a 70% return rate, which was sufficient for this study. However, because the goal of this dissertation also was to provide the most meaningful data possible to those involved with the state standards movement, a follow-up mailing was initiated on September 4th, 2001. The last mailing generated 56 more surveys responses for a grand total of 261, which provided an overall return rate of 89%.

Profile Characteristics

Each independent profile question and the respondents' answers are presented below.

Gender. Ninety-three percent of the respondents were male, and 7% were females.

Age. Age was broken down into 10 year increments. Eleven percent of the respondents were between 24 and 33, 28% between 34 and 43, 42% between 44 and 53, and 20% between 54 and 63. Percentages do not add to 100 because of the rounding of individual percentages.

Free/reduced lunch percentage. Free and reduced lunch percentages were analyzed by examining the criteria used by the federal government when determining schools eligible for various Title I services. Eleven percent of the schools have 0-10% of their students receiving a free or reduced lunch, 45% of the schools have between 11-34% of their students receiving a free or reduced lunch, 24% of the schools have between 35-49% of their students receiving a free or reduced lunch, 17% of the schools have between 50-74% of their students receiving a free or reduced lunch, and 3% of the schools have between 75-100% of their students receiving a free or reduced lunch.

NSAA Classification. Twenty (8%) respondents were class A principals, 32 (12%) were class B, 104 (40%) were class C, and 105 (40%) were class D.

Years as a principal. Nine percent of the principals were either new to the job or had one year of experience, 25% had between 2 and 4 years of experience, 25% had between 5 and 9 years of experience, and 41% had over 10 years of experience.

Amount of training. Sixteen (6%) reported having little or no training in state standards, 63 (24%) reported having a little training, 113 (43%) reported having some training, 61 (23%) reported having quite a bit of training, and 8 (3%) reported having a great deal of training. Percentages do not add to 100 because of the rounding of individual percentages.

Instruments

The Likert-survey that was used in this study utilized questions derived from two separate previously administered surveys. The first was a Virginia study by Duke, Tucker, and Heinecke (2000) that sought to measure Virginia administrator perceptions about educational reform consequences. Questions for their survey were initially developed through several pilot studies conducted by University of Virginia graduate students. The second survey was Johnson's (1981) work which sought to determine administrator perceptions of mandatory evaluation programs in elementary and secondary schools. Her study included validity tests by a panel of experts who offered analysis and recommendations.

Once questions were chosen from these two studies and incorporated into a new Likert-survey, content validity and reliability tests were conducted.

Content validity. To provide evidence of the survey's validity, the questions were reviewed by the Metropolitan Omaha Education Consortium (MOEC) Assessment Task Force. The members of the task force who served as the panel of experts are considered experts on Nebraska's standards/assessment/accountability movement. Using a "panel of experts" to examine the potential survey items is a common method of assessing content appropriateness (DeVellis, 1991).

After gaining support and discussing the details of the validity procedure with the task force chairperson, Dr. Leon Dappen, a personal e-mail was sent to every member in June of 2001. Later, each of the 25 members of the group was asked to read a brief description of the proposed study and complete a survey. The responses drawn from each survey question were used to target how appropriate the assessment

directors believed the questions were by using the following choices: 1) Not appropriate, 2) Marginally appropriate, and 3) Appropriate. In addition, a section reserved for comments was included after the last set of questions. Based on the 20 recommendations (an 80% return rate), modifications were made in both the format and content of the questions.

Reliability. To provide a reliability estimate, the instrument was piloted prior to the full-scale study. The pilot group consisted of the 60 high school principals in the counties closest to the Omaha-metropolitan area: Sarpy, Douglas, Washington, Cass, Otoe, Dodge, Saunders, and Colfax. Of the 60 surveys distributed, 42 (61%) were returned. Thirty-three of the respondents were male (79%), and 9 (21%) were female.

The reliability coefficient for each of the subscales was computed using Cronbach's alpha. On the teacher subscale, the initial reliability coefficient was .75. After analyzing the various questions, one was eliminated. Number 2.12, "Teachers will become more accountable for their student's success", was deleted from the survey because it had a negative correlation with the other survey items. With this deletion, the reliability coefficient for the teacher subscale rose to .78.

On the student subscale, the initial reliability coefficient was .66. After analyzing the various questions, one was eliminated. Number 3.1, "More students will be assigned to special education services or alternative schools", was deleted from the survey because it had a negative correlation with the other survey items. With this deletion, the reliability coefficient for the student subscale rose to .74.

On the administration subscale, the initial reliability coefficient was .76. After analyzing the various questions, one was eliminated. Number 4.8, "Principals will engage in more collaborative planning with other principals", was deleted from the survey because it had a negative correlation with the other survey items. With this deletion, the reliability coefficient for the administration subscale rose to .77.

On the resource allocation subscale, the initial reliability coefficient was .72. On the instruction subscale, the initial reliability coefficient was .75. None of the questions from either of these areas scored at a deletion level.

On the final survey instrument, the reliability coefficient for each of the subscales was again computed using Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficients of the various subscales were as follows: .82 for teacher, .80 for student, .84 for administration, .66 for resource allocation, .74 for instruction, and .91 for overall.

Research Questions

This study sought to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the possible effects of Nebraska state standards as perceived by principals?
2. Is there a difference between male and female principal perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact their schools?
3. Is there a relationship between a principal's age and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
4. Is there a relationship between a principal's school's free and reduced lunch percentage and his/her perception of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

5. Is there a relationship between school enrollment and a principal's perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
6. Is there a relationship between a principal's years as an administrator and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
7. Is there a relationship between a principal's amount of prior standards/assessment/accountability training and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Data Analysis

In each of the research questions, the variable of interest is principal perceptions of the Nebraska state standards/assessment/accountability movement. Demographic variables were used to further examine differences in principal perceptions. The analysis for each question varied:

- Research question 1 employed descriptive statistics to summarize the possible effects of standards as perceived by administrators.
- Research question 2 employed a t-test for examining differences in gender related to principal perceptions.
- Research question 3 employed a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine differences in principal perceptions related to age.
- Research question 4 employed an ANOVA to examine the differences in perceptions related to education level.

- Research question 5 employed an ANOVA to examine the relationship of school enrollment to principal perceptions.
- Research question 6 employed an ANOVA to examine the relationship between a principals' years as a school administrator and his/her perceptions.
- Research question 7 employed an ANOVA to determine the relationship an administrator's prior training has to his/her perceptions of standards.

Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, an alpha level of .01 was used for each analysis to help control for Type I errors.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this survey study was to determine principals' perceptions of Nebraska state standards. Analysis of similar studies and related literature revealed specific areas in which standards most impact schools, including teachers, students, administration, resource allocation, and instruction. Data related to each of the areas were gathered by using a written survey mailed to 293 Nebraska public high school principals of which 261 (89%) were returned. The survey questions were constructed on a 5-point Likert scale where a score of 1 stood for "strongly disagree" and a 5 for "strongly agree".

Some questions were worded in a negative fashion that asked respondents to mark high scores for a negative response. A good example of this type of question is 2.2, which reads, "The stress level among teachers will increase." A positive score in this arrangement would actually reflect a negative outlook for standards. For this question and others coded in this same direction, recoding was a necessary statistical process to ensure that each of the scores was recorded in a manner that would make them easy to compare. For questions that enabled respondents to mark "strongly agree" when responding to a positive question, no recoding was needed. When the necessary means were recoded, a score of 3 was considered neutral. The more positive a score recorded, the closer it was to 5. Conversely, the more negative a score recorded, the closer it was to 1.

When performing statistical analyses of the data collected for each subscale, means were computed from the usable responses. The mean substitution process was

employed for the purpose of being able to use a particular respondent's scores if he/she left some of the items blank.

Research Question 1

What are the possible effects of Nebraska state standards as perceived by principals?

Possible effects on teachers. The overall mean score on the 14-item subscale dealing with the possible effects on teachers was 2.44 (SD= .44). Recoded mean scores for each question ranged from a low of 1.76 on question 2.14 to a high of 3.67 on question 2.4. Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey item and the overall mean of the recoded values for the subscale.

Possible effects on students. The overall mean score on the 8-item subscale dealing with the possible effects on students was 2.94 (SD=.57). Recoded mean scores for each question ranged from a low of 2.58 on question 3.2 to a high of 3.20 on question 3.8. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey item and the overall mean of the recoded values for the subscale.

Possible effects on administration. The overall mean score on the 13-item subscale dealing with the possible effects on administration was 2.03 (SD=.39). Recoded mean scores for each question ranged from a low of 1.81 on questions 4.2 and 4.8 to a high of 2.61 on question 4.6. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey item and the overall mean of the recoded values for the subscale.

Possible effects on resource allocation. The overall mean score on the 6-item subscale dealing with the possible effects on resource allocation was 2.73

Table 1

Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on Teachers

Item	n	M (Recoded M)	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	261	2.20	0.86
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	261	4.18 (1.82)	0.68
2.3 Teachers will resign or retire early (citing standards as a reason).	258	3.29 (2.71)	0.98
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	260	3.67	0.82
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	259	3.41	0.87
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	260	2.81 (3.19)	0.89
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	261	4.22 (1.78)	0.68
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	260	4.26 (1.74)	0.62
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	256	3.55 (2.45)	0.90
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	261	3.57 (2.43)	1.01
2.11 There will be a group of teachers in my school who fully support the movement.	260	3.45	0.93
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	261	4.00 (2.00)	0.56
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	261	4.39 (1.61)	0.61
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	261	1.76	0.61
Recoded M and SD		**2.44**	**0.44**

Table 2

Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on Students

Item	n	M (Recoded M)	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	261	3.18	0.94
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	261	2.58	0.78
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	260	2.93	0.94
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	261	2.80	0.87
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	261	2.89	0.92
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	261	3.04	0.89
3.7 Students will learn more.	261	2.87	0.88
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	260	3.20	0.86
Recoded M and SD		**2.94**	**0.57**

Table 3

Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on Administration

Item	n	M (Recoded M)	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	261	4.15 (1.85)	0.56
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	261	4.19 (1.81)	0.52
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications to the public and staff regarding school progress.	261	4.10 (1.90)	0.52
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	261	3.96 (2.04)	0.56
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	261	3.40 (2.60)	1.01
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	261	3.39 (2.61)	0.95
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports to staff, community, and parents.	261	4.10 (1.90)	0.42
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	260	4.19 (1.81)	0.58
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide leadership regarding instructional methods to improve test results.	260	4.15 (1.85)	0.50
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation and analysis.	259	3.87 (2.13)	0.67
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop even more effective in-services for teachers regarding standards and assessment.	260	4.06 (1.94)	0.55
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	260	4.04 (1.96)	0.77
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	259	4.02 (1.98)	0.71
Recoded M and SD		**2.03**	**0.39**

(SD=.56). Recoded mean scores for each question ranged from a low of 2.42 on question 5.6 to a high of 3.10 on question 5.2. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey item and the overall mean of the recoded values for the subscale.

Possible effects on instruction. The overall mean score on the 9-item subscale dealing with the possible effects on instruction was 3.10 (SD= .51). Recoded mean scores for each question ranged from a low of 2.56 on question 6.8 to a high of 3.49 on question 6.2. Table 5 presents the means and standard deviations of each survey item and the overall mean of the recoded values for the subscale.

Total recoded mean and standard deviation. The overall mean of all the survey items was 2.57 (SD=.35).

Research Question 2

Is there a difference between male and female principal perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact their schools?

Perceived effects on teachers. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male (M=2.44, SD=.44) and female (M=2.45, SD=.51) Nebraska high school principals on the subscale measuring the perceived effects on teachers ($t(256)=-.108$, $p=.914$, two-tailed). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 6 presents the means, standard deviations, and t-tests for each survey item and the overall totals for the subscale.

Table 4

Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on Resource Allocation

Item	n	M (Recoded M)	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm- referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	258	2.92 (3.08)	0.96
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	260	2.90 (3.10)	0.93
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	260	3.13 (2.87)	1.00
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	261	2.95 (3.05)	0.96
5.5 Textbooks/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/local content standards.	261	4.12 (1.88)	0.61
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	261	3.58 (2.42)	0.92
Recoded M and SD		**2.73**	**0.56**

Table 5

Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on Instruction

Item	n	M (Recoded M)	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	261	2.75 (3.25)	0.90
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	261	2.51 (3.49)	0.89
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	260	3.28 (2.72)	0.94
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	261	2.34 (3.26)	0.77
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	261	3.18 (2.82)	0.95
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	261	3.29	0.91
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	258	3.14	0.85
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	260	2.56	0.77
6.9 The standards/assessment/accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	261	3.05 (2.95)	1.02
Recoded M and SD		**3.10**	**0.51**

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests on Perceived Effects on Teacher Subscale Across Gender

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Male			Female			T-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	t	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	240	2.20	.85	18	2.28	1.02	256	-.39	.698
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	240	1.81*	.68	18	1.94*	.73	256	-.82	.413
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	237	2.71*	.97	18	2.56*	1.04	253	.66	.510
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	239	3.65	.83	18	3.89	.76	255	-1.18	.240
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	238	3.41	.86	18	3.33	1.08	254	.37	.715
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	239	3.18*	.90	18	3.28*	.75	255	-.45	.652
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	240	1.77*	.68	18	1.94*	.73	256	-1.06	.289
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	239	1.74*	.63	18	1.72*	.57	255	.15	.882
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	235	2.45*	.89	18	2.44*	1.10	251	.01	.992
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	240	2.42*	1.01	18	2.67*	1.08	256	-1.00	.315
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	239	3.46	.93	18	3.17*	.99	255	1.28	.201
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	240	2.00*	.57	18	2.00*	.34	256	.03	.976
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	240	1.62*	.62	18	1.44*	.51	256	1.19	.237
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	240	1.77	.61	18	1.67*	.59	256	.70	.483
Teacher Subscale Totals	**240**	**2.44**	**.44**	**18**	**2.45**	**.51**	**256**	**-.11**	**.914**

Perceived effects on students. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male (M=2.93, SD=.58) and female (M=3.01, SD=.48) Nebraska high school principals on the subscale measuring the perceived effects on students (t(256)=-.609, p=.543, two-tailed). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 7 presents the means, standard deviations, and t-tests for each survey item and the overall totals for the subscale.

Perceived effects on administration. There was no significant differences between the mean scores of male (M=2.03, SD=.39) and female (M=1.97, SD=.41) Nebraska high school principals on the administration subscale (t(256)=.706, p=.481, two-tailed). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 8 presents the means, standard deviations, and t-tests for each survey item and the overall totals for the subscale.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male (M=2.73, SD=.53) and female (M=2.79, SD=.77) Nebraska high school principals on the subscale measuring the perceived effects on resource allocation (t(256)=-.437, p=.662, two-tailed). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 9 presents the means, standard deviations, and t-tests for each survey item and the overall totals for the subscale.

Perceived effects on instruction. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male (M=3.09, SD=.50) and female (M=3.30,

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests on Perceived Effects on Student Subscale Across Gender

	Male			Female			T-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	t	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	240	3.18	.93	18	3.33	1.00	256	-.21	.837
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	240	2.60	.77	18	2.33	.91	256	1.38	.170
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	239	2.94	.94	18	2.83	.99	255	.45	.652
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	240	2.80	.89	18	2.89	.68	256	-.43	.664
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	240	2.88	.93	18	3.00	.97	256	-.53	.594
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	240	3.02	.89	18	3.39	.92	256	-1.71	.089
3.7 Students will learn more.	240	2.84	.88	18	3.12	.79	256	-1.52	.130
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	239	3.20	.87	18	3.28	.75	255	-.38	.702
Student Subscale Totals	**240**	**2.93**	**.58**	**18**	**3.01**	**.48**	**256**	**-.61**	**.543**

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests on Perceived Effects on Administration Subscale Across Gender

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Male			Female			T-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	t	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	240	1.85*	.57	18	1.78*	.43	256	.53	.597
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	240	1.81*	.50	18	1.83*	.71	256	-.16	.870
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	240	1.90*	.52	18	1.89*	.58	256	.09	.930
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	240	2.05*	.55	18	2.00*	.59	256	.37	.714
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	240	2.59*	1.01	18	2.67*	1.03	256	-.32	.749
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	240	2.62*	.94	18	2.44*	1.10	256	.76	.448
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	240	1.90*	.42	18	1.89*	.47	256	.15	.884
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	239	1.82*	.58	18	1.72*	.57	255	.72	.473
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	239	1.85*	.50	18	1.78*	.43	255	.59	.558
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	238	2.12*	.68	18	2.22*	.65	254	-.63	.527
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	239	1.96*	.54	18	1.67*	.49	255	2.24	.026
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	239	1.96*	.77	18	1.83*	.79	255	.68	.496
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	238	1.99*	.72	18	1.83*	.51	254	.89	.374
Administration Subscale Totals	**240**	**2.03***	**.39**	**18**	**1.97***	**.41**	**256**	**.71**	**.481**

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests on Perceived Effects on Resource Allocation Subscale Across Gender

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Male			Female			T-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	t	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	238	3.08*	.96	18	3.17*	1.04	254	-.37	.713
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	239	3.10*	.89	18	3.06*	1.30	255	.22	.829
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	239	2.87*	.99	18	2.83*	1.10	255	.15	.880
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	240	3.04*	.94	18	3.33*	1.14	256	-1.26	.207
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	240	1.87*	.59	18	1.83*	.71	256	.26	.798
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	240	2.40*	.90	18	2.50*	1.15	256	-.43	.670
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**240**	**2.73***	**.53**	**18**	**2.79***	**.77**	**256**	**-.44**	**.662**

SD=.58) Nebraska high school principals on the subscale measuring the perceived effects on instruction (t(256)=-1.761, p=.079, two-tailed).

Further investigation on the individual questions using t-tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for one question were statistically significant. The finding revealed that females (3.78) were significantly more likely than men (3.09) to believe that teachers will spend more time helping individual students. Table 10 presents the means, standard deviations, and t-tests for each survey item and the overall totals for the subscale.

Total. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of male (M=2.56, SD=.34) and female (M=2.61, SD=.43) Nebraska high school principals on the total scale (t(256)=-.532, p=.595, two-tailed).

Research Question 3

Is there a relationship between a principal's age and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Perceived effects on teachers. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the teacher subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools (F(3,256)=2.092, p=.102). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no differences. Table 11 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the teacher subscale as it relates to age of principals.

Perceived effects on students. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the student subscale, there

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-tests on Perceived Effects on Instruction Subscale Across Gender

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Male			Female			T-Test		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	t	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	240	3.24*	.89	18	3.39*	1.04	256	-.69	.490
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	240	3.48*	.89	18	3.67*	.91	256	-.86	.391
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	240	2.70*	.92	18	2.94*	1.11	255	-1.06	.292
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	240	3.64*	.77	18	3.94*	.80	256	-1.61	.109
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	240	2.83*	.95	18	2.78*	1.00	256	.22	.825
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	240	3.28	.91	18	3.56	.86	256	-1.25	.212
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	237	3.09	.85	18	3.78	.55	253	-3.37	.001
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	239	2.56	.76	18	2.50	.79	255	.32	.746
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	240	2.94*	1.04	18	3.17*	.86	256	-.92	.361
Instruction Subscale Totals	**240**	**3.09***	**.50**	**18**	**3.30***	**.58**	**256**	**-1.76**	**.079**

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale Across Principal Age Groups (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 24-33			Ages 34-43			Ages 44-53		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	28	2.29	.90	72	2.14	.83	109	2.10	.77
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	28	1.89*	.79	72	1.83*	.63	109	1.76*	.67
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	28	2.79*	.88	71	2.54*	.94	107	2.70*	.95
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	28	3.86	.76	72	3.75	.75	109	3.65	.82
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	28	3.39	.83	72	3.46	.85	107	3.44	.87
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	28	3.21*	.83	71	3.13*	.94	109	3.19*	.89
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	28	1.75*	.56	72	1.81*	.72	109	1.70*	.66
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	28	1.86*	.85	72	1.67*	.53	109	1.71*	.60
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	28	2.61*	.83	72	2.32*	.84	105	2.39*	.89
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	28	2.68*	.86	72	2.40*	1.02	109	2.33*	1.05
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	28	3.75	.80	72	3.36	.91	108	3.38	.99
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	28	1.89*	.50	72	2.04*	.64	109	1.96*	.53
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	28	1.75*	.65	72	1.53*	.58	109	1.54*	.52
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	28	1.71	.60	72	1.75	.55	109	1.71	.66
Teacher Subscale Totals	**28**	**2.53***	**.33**	**72**	**2.41***	**.41**	**109**	**2.39***	**.42**

Table 11 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale Across Principal Age Groups

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 54-63			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	51	2.47	1.03	3,256	2.41	.068
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	51	1.82*	.68	3,256	.53	.661
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	51	2.94*	1.10	3,253	1.78	.151
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	50	3.48	.95	3,255	1.62	.185
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	51	3.31	.95	3,254	.32	.813
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	51	3.25*	.87	3,255	.22	.885
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	51	1.92*	.72	3,256	1.32	.270
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	50	1.86*	.64	3,255	1.40	.244
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	50	2.68*	1.02	3,251	2.04	.108
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	51	2.57*	1.01	3,256	1.25	.292
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	51	3.55	.90	3,255	1.58	.195
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	51	2.00*	.56	3,256	1.15	.328
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	51	1.78*	.76	3,256	1.03	.038
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	51	1.92	.56	3,256	1.56	.200
Teacher Subscale Totals	**51**	**2.55***	**.55**	**3,256**	**1.65**	**.178**

were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=1.077$, $p=.359$).

Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for one question were statistically significant. The finding revealed that principals between the ages of 44-53 were significantly less likely than principals in the other age brackets to perceive students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention. Table 12 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the student subscale as it relates to age of principals.

Perceived effects on administration. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the administration subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.967$, $p=.409$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 13 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the administration subscale as it relates to age of principals.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the resource allocation subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.956$, $p=.414$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 14 presents the sample sizes, means, standard

Table 12

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale Across Principal Age Groups (Continued on next page)

	Ages 24-33			Ages 34-43			Ages 44-53		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	28	3.36	.87	72	3.17	.99	109	3.09	.89
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	28	2.82	.86	72	2.49	.71	109	2.51	.70
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	28	3.14	.97	71	3.01	.92	109	2.68	.88
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	28	2.82	.90	72	2.83	.87	109	2.76	.82
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	28	2.75	.97	72	2.93	.95	109	2.83	.89
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	28	2.82	.86	72	3.08	.87	109	3.06	.91
3.7 Students will learn more.	28	2.82	.86	72	2.83	.93	109	2.85	.86
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	28	3.25	.84	72	3.32	.82	109	3.15	.86
Student Subscale Totals	**28**	**2.97**	**.47**	**72**	**2.96**	**.60**	**109**	**2.87**	**.56**

Table 12 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale Across Principal Age Groups

	Ages 54-63			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	51	3.24	.97	3,256	.72	.544
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	51	2.67	.89	3,256	1.78	.152
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	51	3.24	.95	3,255	5.34	.001
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	51	2.86	.98	3,256	.19	.902
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	51	3.06	.93	3,256	1.00	.392
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	51	3.06	.93	3,256	.65	.586
3.7 Students will learn more.	51	2.98	.86	3,256	.35	.789
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	50	3.16	.93	3,255	.66	.578
Student Subscale Totals	**51**	**3.03**	**.59**	**3,256**	**1.08**	**.359**

Table 13

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale Across Principal Age Groups (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 24-33			Ages 34-43			Ages 44-53		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	28	1.96*	.64	72	1.86*	.59	109	1.76*	.47
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	28	1.86*	.65	72	1.83*	.47	109	1.76*	.53
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	28	1.79*	.50	72	1.97*	.56	109	1.88*	.56
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	28	1.86*	.52	72	2.18*	.66	109	2.01*	.54
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	28	2.93*	1.15	72	2.54*	.98	109	2.50*	.94
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	28	2.61*	.99	72	2.50*	.96	109	2.59*	.89
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	28	1.86*	.52	72	1.90*	.34	109	1.90*	.49
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	28	1.82*	.55	72	1.75*	.50	108	1.82*	.65
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	28	1.71*	.46	72	1.86*	.48	109	1.83*	.40
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	28	2.14*	.71	72	2.08*	.52	108	2.14*	.80
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	28	1.93*	.54	72	1.97*	.50	109	1.88*	.62
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	28	2.04*	.84	72	1.92*	.73	109	1.92*	.80
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	28	1.82*	.67	72	2.08*	.69	109	1.93*	.73
Administration Subscale Totals	**28**	**2.02***	**.51**	**72**	**2.04***	**.34**	**109**	**1.99***	**.41**

Table 13 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale Across Principal Age Groups

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 54-63			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	51	1.96*	.63	3,256	2.00	.115
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	51	1.86*	.49	3,256	.62	.606
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	51	1.92*	.39	3,256	.98	.403
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	51	2.02*	.42	3,256	2.71	.045
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	51	2.71*	1.10	3,256	1.59	.193
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	51	2.84*	1.01	3,256	1.37	.252
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	51	1.94*	.31	3,256	.25	.863
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	51	1.88*	.55	3,255	.54	.658
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	50	1.94*	.55	3,255	1.34	.263
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	50	2.16*	.55	3,254	.16	.926
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	50	2.04*	.45	3,255	1.06	.368
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	50	2.06*	.77	3,255	.55	.649
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	49	2.04*	.71	3,254	1.31	.271
Administration Subscale Totals	**51**	**2.11***	**.33**	**3,256**	**.97**	**.409**

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale Across Principal Age Groups (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 24-33			Ages 34-43			Ages 44-53		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced Tests (ie. 11th grade English).	28	2.89*	1.03	72	3.00*	.98	107	3.20*	.93
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	28	3.25*	.75	72	3.08*	.95	108	3.00*	.98
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	28	3.04*	1.04	72	2.63*	.97	108	2.89*	1.02
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	28	2.86*	1.00	72	3.08*	.90	109	2.98*	1.00
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	28	1.68*	.48	72	1.79*	.58	109	1.92*	.63
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	28	2.50*	.88	72	2.36*	.86	109	2.38*	.97
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**28**	**2.76***	**.49**	**72**	**2.66***	**.52**	**109**	**2.73***	**.57**

Table 14 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale Across Principal Age Groups

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 54-63			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced Tests (ie. 11th grade English).	50	3.06*	.98	3,253	1.05	.373
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	51	3.24*	.89	3,255	1.03	.381
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	51	3.06*	.95	3,255	2.35	.073
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	51	3.08*	1.00	3,256	.50	.685
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	51	2.00*	.63	3,256	2.38	.070
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	51	2.51*	.92	3,256	.40	.750
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**51**	**2.83***	**.60**	**3,256**	**.96**	**.414**

deviations, and ANOVAS for the resource allocation subscale as it relates to the age of principals.

Perceived effects on instruction. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the instruction subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.296$, $p=.828$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 15 presents sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the instruction subscale as it relates to age of principals.

Total. On the total scale, there were no statistically significant differences across principal age groups on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.298$, $p=.828$).

Research Question 4

Is there a relationship between a principal's school's free and reduced lunch percentage and his/her perception of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Perceived effects on teachers. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the teacher subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=.890$, $p=.470$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 16 presents the sample sizes, means, standard

Table 15

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale Across Principal Age Groups (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 24-33			Ages 34-43			Ages 44-53		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	28	3.39*	.74	72	3.18*	.88	109	3.26*	.94
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	28	3.68*	.86	72	3.51*	.86	109	3.38*	.97
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which Their students will be evaluated.	28	2.71*	.85	72	2.72*	.89	109	2.70*	.99
6.4 Course content covered after the State test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	28	3.64*	.62	72	3.78*	.65	109	3.63*	.89
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	28	3.21*	.99	72	2.69*	.88	109	2.84*	.98
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	28	3.29	.81	72	3.29	.90	109	3.19	.94
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	27	3.22	.93	71	3.13	.84	108	3.12	.85
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	28	2.64	.78	72	2.46	.69	108	2.64	.83
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	28	2.68*	1.02	72	3.04*	1.00	109	2.92*	.98
Instruction Subscale Totals	**28**	**3.16***	**.43**	**72**	**3.09**	**.47**	**109**	**3.08***	**.56**

Table 15 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale Across Principal Age Groups

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Ages 54-63			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	51	3.22*	.92	3,256	.40	.753
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	51	3.61*	.77	3,256	1.32	.268
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which Their students will be evaluated.	50	2.78*	.95	3,255	.09	.966
6.4 Course content covered after the State test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	51	3.59*	.73	3,256	.75	.523
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	51	2.75*	.91	3,256	2.18	.090
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	51	3.49	.90	3,256	1.25	.293
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	51	3.16	.83	3,253	.12	.951
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	51	2.47	.73	3,255	1.14	.333
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	51	3.10*	1.10	3,256	1.25	.292
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**51**	**3.13***	**.49**	**3,256**	**1.65**	**.178**

Table 16

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-10%			11-34%			35-49%		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	26	2.42	.76	111	2.15	.89	60	2.23	.87
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	26	2.23*	.99	111	1.71*	.55	60	1.82*	.65
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	25	2.96*	1.02	109	2.64*	.92	60	2.63*	1.01
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	26	3.73	.53	110	3.65	.89	60	3.72	.87
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	26	3.27	.78	110	3.49	.88	59	3.36	.98
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	25	3.20*	1.04	111	3.21*	.86	60	3.25*	.89
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	26	2.00*	.63	111	1.69*	.58	60	1.70*	.59
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	25	2.00*	.65	111	1.67*	.56	60	1.68*	.60
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	26	2.73*	.62	109	2.42*	.96	60	2.33*	.86
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	26	2.54*	.95	111	2.47*	1.03	60	2.33*	1.07
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	26	3.69	.68	110	3.51	.94	60	3.45	.96
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather And assess information concerning the needs of students.	26	2.19*	.49	111	1.94*	.53	60	2.02*	.65
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	26	1.50*	.51	111	1.61*	.65	60	1.52*	.54
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	26	1.77	.59	111	1.71	.58	60	1.73	.52
Teacher Subscale Totals	**26**	**2.59***	**.39**	**111**	**2.42***	**.44**	**60**	**2.41***	**.44**

Table 16 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	50-74%			75-100%			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	41	2.05	.89	7	2.43	1.13	4,240	.94	.443
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	41	1.85*	.76	7	1.71*	.49	4,240	3.26	.013
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	41	2.61*	.83	7	3.29*	1.50	4,237	1.37	.246
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	41	3.61	.83	7	3.43	.79	4,239	.282	.889
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	41	3.39	.83	7	3.14	.90	4,238	.61	.654
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	41	3.22*	.88	7	3.00*	.82	4,239	.13	.972
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	41	1.95*	.84	7	2.00*	1.00	4,240	2.36	.054
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	41	1.85*	.61	7	2.00*	1.15	4,239	2.34	.056
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	38	2.39*	.79	7	2.43*	1.13	4,235	.90	.465
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	41	2.34*	.94	7	2.29*	1.25	4,240	.35	.847
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	41	3.20	.93	7	3.14	1.22	4,239	1.52	.196
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	41	2.02*	.52	7	2.00*	.58	4,240	1.16	.328
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	41	1.71*	.60	7	1.57*	.53	4,240	.81	.522
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	41	1.90	.70	7	2.00	.82	4,240	1.09	.363
Student Subscale Totals	**41**	**2.44***	**.42**	**7**	**2.46***	**.72**	**4,240**	**.89**	**.470**

deviations, and ANOVAs for the teacher subscale as it relates to a school's free/reduced lunch percentage.

Perceived effects on students. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the student subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=1.601$, $p=.175$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 17 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the student subscale as it relates to a school's free/reduced lunch percentage.

Perceived effects on administration. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the administration subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=.822$, $p=.512$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 18 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the administration subscale as it relates to a school's free/reduced lunch percentage.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the resourced allocation subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=1.135$, $p=.341$). Further investigation on the individual

Table 17

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage (Continued on next page)

	0-10%			11-34%			35-49%		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	26	3.62	.75	111	3.05	.95	60	3.12	.92
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	26	2.54	.65	111	2.48	.71	60	2.57	.74
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	26	2.88	.91	111	2.77	.89	59	3.03	.95
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	26	3.08	.80	111	2.80	.92	60	2.93	.84
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	26	3.27	.67	111	2.80	.91	60	2.98	.97
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	26	3.12	.91	111	2.97	.93	60	3.02	.85
3.7 Students will learn more.	26	3.31	.74	111	2.79	.89	60	3.00	.88
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	26	3.46	.71	111	3.22	.89	59	3.14	.86
Student Subscale Totals	**26**	**3.16**	**.48**	**111**	**2.86**	**.61**	**60**	**2.97**	**.51**

Table 17 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage

	50-74%			75-100%			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	41	3.24	1.02	7	3.57	.79	4,240	2.42	.049
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	41	2.73	.95	7	3.29	1.11	4,240	2.37	.053
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	41	3.10	1.00	7	3.43	1.13	4,239	1.80	.130
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	41	2.54	.84	7	2.57	.79	4,240	2.04	.089
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	41	2.76	.92	7	3.00	1.00	4,240	1.81	.128
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	41	3.07	.85	7	3.14	1.22	4,240	.22	.930
3.7 Students will learn more.	41	2.73	.84	7	2.71	.95	4,240	2.53	.041
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	41	3.37	.83	7	2.29	.76	4,239	3.08	.017
Student Subscale Totals	**41**	**2.94**	**.56**	**7**	**3.00**	**.40**	**4,240**	**1.60**	**.175**

Table 18

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded

	0-10%			11-34%			35-49%		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	26	1.92*	.63	111	1.86*	.53	60	1.82*	.62
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	26	1.81*	.40	111	1.88*	.58	60	1.75*	.51
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	26	1.88*	.43	111	1.96*	.58	60	1.88*	.49
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	26	1.96*	.53	111	2.14*	.63	60	1.95*	.53
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	26	2.88*	.86	111	2.59*	1.00	60	2.55*	1.00
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	26	2.69*	1.01	111	2.60*	.96	60	2.60*	.96
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	26	1.85*	.37	111	1.93*	.44	60	1.88*	.37
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	26	1.85*	.46	111	1.78*	.61	60	1.77*	.50
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	26	1.92*	.48	111	1.80*	.50	60	1.82*	.47
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	26	2.15*	.54	111	2.12*	.72	60	2.18*	.70
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	26	1.92*	.48	111	2.00*	.60	60	1.92*	.53
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	26	1.95*	.87	111	1.99*	.79	60	1.80*	.63
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	26	1.85*	.73	111	2.06*	.68	59	1.92*	.75
Administration Subscale Totals	**26**	**2.05***	**.40**	**111**	**2.06***	**.40**	**60**	**1.99***	**.40**

Table 18 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	50-74%			75-100%			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	41	1.85*	.53	7	1.71*	.49	4,240	.28	.890
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	41	1.73*	.45	7	1.71*	.49	4,240	1.01	.401
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	41	1.88*	.51	7	1.71*	.49	4,240	.53	.715
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	41	2.00*	.45	7	2.14*	.38	4,240	1.53	.194
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	41	2.51*	1.05	7	3.00*	1.41	4,240	.92	.456
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	41	2.56*	.87	7	3.14*	1.22	4,240	.61	.653
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	41	1.85*	.42	7	2.14*	.38	4,240	.99	.412
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	41	1.90*	.66	7	2.14*	.69	4,240	.99	.415
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	40	1.83*	.45	7	2.29*	.76	4,239	1.83	.123
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	39	2.00*	.51	7	2.00*	.00	4,238	.53	.712
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	40	1.85*	.43	7	2.29*	.76	4,239	1.27	.284
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	40	2.00*	.78	7	2.29*	.76	4,239	1.04	.385
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	40	1.85*	.62	7	2.14*	.69	4,238	1.21	.309
Administration Subscale Totals	**41**	**1.98***	**.35**	**7**	**2.21***	**.21**	**4,240**	**.82**	**.512**

questions also revealed no significance. Table 19 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the resource allocation subscale as it relates to a school's free/reduced lunch percentage.

Perceived effects on instruction. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the instruction subscale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=1.736$, $p=.143$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 20 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the instruction subscale as it relates to a school's free/reduced lunch percentage.

Total. On the total subscale, there were no significant differences across schools' free/reduced lunch groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=.920$, $p=.453$).

Research Question 5

Is there a relationship between school enrollment and a principal's perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Perceived effects on teachers. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the teacher subscale, there was a statistically significant difference across school enrollment size on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,257)=6.909$, $p<.0005$).

Table 19

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-10%			11-34%			35-49%		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	26	2.77*	1.07	110	3.32*	.94	58	2.88*	.88
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	26	2.96*	.96	111	3.21*	.92	59	2.98*	.97
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	26	2.85*	1.05	111	2.84*	1.00	59	2.88*	1.07
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	26	3.42*	.95	111	3.18*	.96	60	2.98*	.95
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	26	1.85*	.46	111	1.88*	.63	60	1.87*	.68
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	26	2.15*	.83	111	2.42*	.86	60	2.45*	.95
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**26**	**2.67***	**.53**	**111**	**2.81***	**.53**	**60**	**2.68***	**.63**

Table 19 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	50-74%			75-100%			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	41	2.93*	.93	7	3.00*	1.29	4,237	3.36	.011
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	41	2.93*	.93	7	3.43*	.79	4,239	1.29	.273
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	41	2.83*	.95	7	3.00*	1.15	4,239	.06	.993
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	41	2.68*	.85	7	2.86*	1.21	4,240	3.20	.014
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	41	1.90*	.58	7	1.71*	.49	4,240	1.61	.958
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	41	2.43*	1.27	7	2.43*	1.27	4,240	.56	.690
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**41**	**2.62***	**.52**	**7**	**2.74***	**.64**	**4,240**	**1.14**	**.341**

Table 20

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-10%			11-34%			35-49%		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	26	3.12*	.95	111	3.36*	.91	60	3.17*	.87
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	26	3.62*	.75	111	3.48*	.90	60	3.48*	.98
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	26	2.77*	.99	11	2.85*	.93	60	2.58*	.94
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	26	3.92*	.48	111	3.74*	.79	60	3.63*	.69
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	26	2.92*	.93	111	2.80*	.98	60	2.90*	.97
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	26	3.46	.95	111	3.25	.93	60	3.18	.87
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	26	3.42	.76	111	3.01	.84	59	3.24	.90
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	26	2.23	.59	111	2.51	.74	59	2.58	.81
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	26	3.31*	.88	111	2.84*	1.05	60	3.12*	.94
Instruction Subscale Totals	**26**	**3.20***	**.42**	**111**	**3.09***	**.55**	**60**	**3.10***	**.51**

Table 20 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Free/Reduced Lunch Percentage

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	50-74%			75-100%			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	41	3.00*	.92	7	3.57*	.53	4,240	1.68	.154
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	41	3.32*	.96	7	3.71*	.76	4,240	.58	.678
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	41	2.54*	.90	7	3.00*	1.00	4,239	1.38	.242
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	41	3.34*	.88	7	3.66*	.78	4,240	2.89	.023
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	41	2.59*	.92	7	3.14*	.90	4,240	.99	.412
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	41	3.17	.89	7	4.14	.38	4,240	2.21	.069
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	40	3.13	.88	7	3.43	.79	4,238	1.78	.134
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	41	2.78	.91	7	2.71	.49	4,239	2.20	.069
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	41	2.78*	.96	7	3.57*	1.27	4,240	2.55	.040
Instruction Subscale Totals	**41**	**2.96***	**.49**	**7**	**3.43***	**.32**	**4.240**	**.92**	**.453**

Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for four questions were statistically significant. Questions 2.2, 2.8, and 2.13 revealed that Class A principals were significantly less likely than principals from Class C and D to perceive that the stress level among teachers will increase, teachers will have more workshops to attend, and record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers. Furthermore, question 2.7 revealed that principals from Class A schools were significantly less likely than principals from Class B, C, and D to perceive that teachers will have more committee work responsibilities. Table 21 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the teacher subscale as it relates to school enrollment.

Perceived effects on students. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the student subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across school enrollment size on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,257)=2.983$, $p=.032$). Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for three questions were statistically significant. Questions 3.1 and 3.7 revealed that Class A principals were significantly more convinced than principals from classes B, C and D that more students who need assistance will be identified and students will learn more. Question 3.6 revealed Class A principals were significantly more convinced than principals from classes B and C that students will become more accountable for their own success. Table 22 presents the sample sizes, means,

Table 21

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by School Enrollment Size (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	20	2.60	1.19	32	2.19	.78	104	2.17	.89
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	20	2.25*	1.02	32	1.97*	.86	104	1.75*	.57
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	20	3.15*	.75	30	2.77*	.97	103	2.62*	1.02
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	19	3.89	.66	32	3.50	.80	104	3.72	.81
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	20	3.75	.85	32	3.06	.98	103	3.42	.87
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	20	3.60*	.94	32	3.34*	.87	104	3.21*	.87
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	20	2.45*	.89	32	1.72*	.52	104	1.60*	.62
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	19	2.21*	.54	32	1.94*	.56	104	1.66*	.66
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	18	2.89*	.83	31	2.48*	.93	103	2.39*	.96
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	20	3.05*	1.15	32	2.44*	1.01	104	2.38*	1.01
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	20	3.95	.76	32	3.44	.91	104	3.40	.93
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	20	2.00*	.32	32	2.06*	.56	104	1.98*	.64
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	20	2.05*	.69	32	1.63*	.55	104	1.51*	.64
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	20	2.10	.45	32	1.84	.45	104	1.66	.63
Teacher Subscale Totals	**20**	**2.85***	**.49**	**32**	**2.46***	**.44**	**104**	**2.39***	**.42**

Table 21 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by School Enrollment Size

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class D			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	105	2.16	.77	3,257	1.56	.200
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	105	1.76*	.60	3,257	3.99	.008
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	105	2.70*	.96	3,254	1.69	.169
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	105	3.62	.87	3,256	1.19	.313
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	104	3.45	.82	3,255	2.84	.038
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	104	3.04*	.88	3,256	2.84	.039
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	105	1.85*	.66	3,257	10.38	<.0005
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	105	1.68*	.56	3,256	5.94	.001
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	104	2.42*	.83	3,252	1.64	.181
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	105	2.37*	.96	3,257	2.78	.042
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	104	3.39	.96	3,256	2.14	.095
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	105	2.01*	.51	3,257	.18	.910
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	105	1.62*	.54	3,257	4.64	.004
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	105	1.77	.62	3,257	3.28	.021
Teacher Subscale Totals	**105**	**2.41***	**.41**	**3,257**	**6.91**	**<.0005**

Table 22

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by School Enrollment Size (Continued on next page)

	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	20	3.85	.59	32	3.16	.85	104	3.13	.95
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	20	2.50	.76	32	2.63	.75	104	2.55	.74
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	20	2.80	.95	32	2.78	.98	103	2.92	.91
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	20	3.20	.77	32	2.56	.75	104	2.89	.92
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	20	3.15	.81	32	2.66	.97	104	2.96	.94
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	20	3.60	.75	32	2.88	.87	104	2.92	.96
3.7 Students will learn more.	20	3.45	.60	32	2.53	.84	104	2.87	.90
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	20	3.45	.76	32	3.03	.93	104	3.10	.90
Student Subscale Totals	**20**	**3.25**	**.43**	**32**	**2.78**	**.49**	**104**	**2.92**	**.61**

Table 22 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by School Enrollment Size

	Class D			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	105	3.10	.97	3,257	3.92	.009
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	105	2.61	.84	3,257	.21	.888
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	105	3.02	.95	3,256	.71	.547
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	105	2.71	.84	3,257	3.01	.031
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	105	2.85	.90	3,257	1.51	.213
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	105	3.10	.81	3,257	3.91	.009
3.7 Students will learn more.	105	2.87	.86	3,257	4.71	.003
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	104	3.32	.80	3,256	2.14	.095
Student Subscale Totals	**105**	**2.95**	**.55**	**3,257**	**2.98**	**.032**

standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the student subscale as it relates to school enrollment.

Perceived effects on administration. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the administration subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across school enrollment size on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,257)=.593$, $p=.620$).

Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for one question were statistically significant. Question 4.8 revealed that Class A principals were less convinced than principals from classes C and D that principals will have more workshops to attend. Table 23 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the administration subscale as it relates to school enrollment size.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the resource allocation subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across school enrollment size on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,257)=1.611$, $p=.187$). Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for one question were statistically significant. Question 5.1 revealed that Class D principals were significantly more convinced than principals from class C that the most capable teachers will be

Table 23

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by School Enrollment Size (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	20	1.95*	.69	32	1.84*	.51	104	1.82*	.62
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	20	1.80*	.41	32	1.81*	.47	104	1.78*	.62
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	20	1.80*	.41	32	1.91*	.39	104	1.90*	.58
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	20	1.90*	.48	32	2.03*	.59	104	2.12*	.63
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	20	3.05*	.89	32	2.75*	.95	104	2.54*	1.05
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	20	3.10*	.85	32	2.69*	.93	104	2.56*	.97
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	20	1.95*	.22	32	1.81*	.40	104	1.93*	.47
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	20	2.25*	.55	31	1.87*	.62	104	1.70*	.59
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	20	1.90*	.31	32	1.84*	.51	104	1.82*	.50
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	20	2.15*	.75	32	2.03*	.47	104	2.13*	.74
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	20	1.85*	.37	32	1.97*	.40	104	1.96*	.64
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	20	2.30*	.80	32	2.06*	.95	104	1.88*	.83
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	19	1.74*	.65	32	1.88*	.66	104	2.01*	.76
Administration Subscale Totals	**20**	**2.14***	**.32**	**32**	**2.04***	**.38**	**104**	**2.01***	**.43**

Table 23 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by School Enrollment Size

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class D			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	105	1.87*	.48	3,257	.36	.781
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	105	1.85*	.43	3,257	.31	.819
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	105	1.92*	.51	3,257	.31	.815
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	105	2.00*	.48	3,257	1.24	.294
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	105	2.52*	.99	3,257	1.91	.128
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	105	2.55*	.93	3,257	2.11	.099
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	105	1.90*	.41	3,257	.75	.524
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	105	1.83*	.53	3,256	5.50	.001
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	104	1.87*	.52	3,256	.25	.864
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	103	2.15*	.65	3,255	.25	.860
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	104	1.93*	.53	3,256	.26	.851
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	104	1.94*	.62	3,256	1.94	.124
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	104	2.03*	.67	3,255	1.21	.305
Administration Subscale Totals	**105**	**2.03***	**.37**	**3,257**	**.59**	**.620**

assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English). Table 24 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the resource allocation subscale as it relates to school enrollment size.

Perceived effects on instruction. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the instruction subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across school enrollment size on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,257)=1.171$, $p=.321$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 25 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the instruction subscale as it relates to school enrollment size.

Total. On the total scale, there were no statistically significant differences across schools size groups on principal perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,240)=.920$, $p=.453$).

Research Question 6

Is there a relationship between a principal's years as an administrator and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Perceived effects on teachers. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the teacher subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' years of experience on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.165$, $p=.920$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no

Table 24

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by School Enrollment Size (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	20	3.00*	.79	32	3.06*	1.05	102	3.32*	.92
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	20	3.20*	1.11	32	3.19*	.93	103	3.09*	.93
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	20	3.10*	.91	32	2.78*	1.04	103	2.90*	1.01
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	20	3.30*	1.03	32	3.21*	.98	104	3.05*	.99
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	20	2.20*	.62	32	1.94*	.35	104	1.85*	.66
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	20	2.70*	.98	32	2.25*	.84	104	2.41*	.92
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**20**	**2.92***	**.52**	**32**	**2.74***	**.56**	**104**	**2.77***	**.56**

Table 24 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by School Enrollment Size

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class D			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	104	2.87*	.96	3,254	4.11	.007
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	105	3.06*	.90	3,256	.25	.861
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	105	2.81*	.99	3,256	.60	.616
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	105	2.96*	.91	3,257	1.08	.359
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	105	1.83*	.60	3,257	2.34	.074
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	105	2.41*	.93	3,257	.99	.399
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**105**	**2.65***	**.53**	**3,257**	**1.61**	**.187**

Table 25

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by School Enrollment Size (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class A			Class B			Class C		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	20	3.15*	1.04	32	3.25*	.98	104	3.27*	.87
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	20	3.50*	.76	32	3.50*	.88	104	3.55*	.89
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	20	2.90*	.97	32	2.88*	1.07	104	2.77*	.99
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	20	3.85*	.59	32	3.72*	.85	104	3.73*	.73
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	20	2.95*	1.00	32	2.91*	1.15	104	2.89*	.96
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	20	3.25	.97	32	3.44	.80	104	3.29	.93
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	20	3.35	.81	32	3.03	.90	101	3.18	.85
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	20	2.65	.67	32	2.41	.76	103	2.53	.78
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	20	3.55*	.76	32	2.88*	1.13	104	2.95*	1.05
Instruction Subscale Totals	**20**	**3.24***	**.50**	**32**	**3.11***	**.57**	**104**	**3.13***	**.49**

Table 25 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by School Enrollment Size

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Class D			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	105	3.24*	.87	3,257	.10	.959
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	105	3.43*	.93	3,257	.31	.817
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	104	2.59*	.82	3,256	1.35	.259
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	105	3.54*	.81	3,257	1.58	.195
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	105	2.70*	.85	3,257	.94	.422
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	105	3.25	.91	3,257	.37	.776
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	105	3.10	.84	3,254	.75	.525
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	105	2.61	.78	3,256	.70	.551
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	105	2.87*	.98	3,257	2.64	.050
Instruction Subscale Totals	**105**	**3.04***	**.50**	**3,257**	**1.17**	**.321**

significance. Table 26 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the teacher subscale as it relates to principal's years as an administrator.

Perceived effects on students. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the student subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' years of experience on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=1.134$, $p=.336$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 27 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the student subscale as it relates to principal's years as an administrator.

Perceived effects on administration. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the administration subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' years of experience on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=.611$, $p=.608$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 28 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the administration subscale as it relates to principal's years as an administrator.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the resource allocation subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' years of experience on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=1.399$, $p=.244$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 29 presents the sample sizes, means, standard

Table 26

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Years as a Principal

(Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-1 Years			2-4 Years			5-9 Years		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	24	2.38	1.06	66	2.15	.79	64	2.17	.86
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	24	1.88*	.80	66	1.82*	.76	64	1.81*	.50
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	24	2.71*	.91	65	2.71*	1.01	63	2.76*	1.00
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	24	3.92	.58	66	3.70	.86	64	3.61	.88
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	24	3.71	.55	66	3.42	.81	63	3.25	.98
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	24	3.04*	.81	65	3.14*	.93	64	3.38*	.83
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	24	1.83*	.92	66	1.79*	.67	64	1.78*	.60
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	24	1.58*	.65	66	1.70*	.70	63	1.81*	.56
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	24	2.50*	.83	65	2.40*	.93	62	2.40*	.91
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	24	2.42*	.93	66	2.39*	1.05	64	2.44*	1.01
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	24	3.58	.93	66	3.56	.86	63	3.38	.97
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	24	2.13*	.68	66	1.97*	.58	64	2.05*	.60
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	24	1.67*	.82	66	1.61*	.63	64	1.63*	.68
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	24	1.71	.69	66	1.73	.57	64	1.75	.50
Teacher Subscale Totals	**24**	**2.50***	**.43**	**66**	**2.43***	**.45**	**64**	**2.44***	**.42**

Table 26 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Years as a Principal

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	10> Years			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	106	2.22	.86	3,256	.43	.730
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	106	1.81*	.69	3,256	.06	.980
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	105	2.67*	.97	3,253	.12	.946
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	105	3.62	.81	3,255	.98	.402
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	105	3.44	.90	3,254	1.65	.178
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	106	3.15*	.90	3,255	1.30	.275
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	106	1.75*	.69	3,256	.10	.962
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	106	1.76*	.59	3,255	.93	.427
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	104	2.50*	.90	3,251	.25	.861
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	106	2.47*	1.02	3,256	.08	.969
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	106	3.41	.93	3,255	.68	.568
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	106	1.97*	.49	3,256	.70	.554
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	106	1.59*	.49	3,256	.11	.957
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	106	1.79	.66	3,256	.23	.876
Teacher Subscale Totals	**106**	**2.44***	**.45**	**3,256**	**.17**	**.920**

Table 27

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Years as a Principal

(Continued on next page)

	0-1 Years			2-4 Years			5-9 Years		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	24	3.46	.72	66	3.30	1.01	64	3.06	.97
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	24	2.79	.83	66	2.65	.85	64	2.52	.76
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	24	2.88	.95	66	3.02	.95	64	2.86	1.07
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	24	3.00	.83	66	2.86	.91	64	2.67	.87
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	24	3.08	.78	66	2.82	1.04	64	2.78	.90
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	24	3.13	.80	66	3.06	.94	64	3.05	.92
3.7 Students will learn more.	24	3.00	.83	66	2.89	.96	64	2.78	.88
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	24	3.29	.86	66	3.30	.88	64	3.13	.81
Students Subscale Totals	**24**	**3.08**	**.52**	**66**	**2.99**	**.62**	**64**	**2.86**	**.60**

Table 27 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Years as a Principal

	10> Years			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	106	3.11	.90	3,259	1.62	.186
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	106	2.53	.73	3,256	1.08	.359
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	105	2.93	.85	3,255	.39	.805
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	106	2.80	.86	3,256	1.00	.395
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	106	2.96	.89	3,256	1.00	.396
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	106	3.01	.88	3,256	.13	.945
3.7 Students will learn more.	106	2.88	.84	3,256	.41	.746
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	105	3.17	.89	3,255	.60	.617
Student Subscale Totals	**106**	**2.92**	**.53**	**3,256**	**1.13**	**.336**

Table 28

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Years as a Principal (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-1 Years			2-4 Years			5-9 Years		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	24	1.83*	.64	66	2.00*	.61	64	1.83*	.55
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	24	1.79*	.59	66	1.88*	.51	64	1.83*	.42
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	24	1.75*	.44	66	1.97*	.46	64	1.97*	.47
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	24	1.96*	.55	66	2.00*	.53	64	2.13*	.52
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	24	2.67*	1.05	66	2.74*	1.03	64	2.56*	.99
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	24	2.58*	.97	66	2.56*	1.01	64	2.61*	.94
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	24	1.83*	.48	66	1.89*	.40	64	1.92*	.32
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	24	1.88*	.61	66	1.85*	.53	64	1.81*	.66
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	24	1.83*	.38	66	1.80*	.53	64	1.88*	.49
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	24	2.25*	.90	66	2.17*	.62	64	2.14*	.64
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	24	1.79*	.59	66	2.02*	.57	64	1.98*	.42
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	24	2.04*	.81	66	2.15*	.79	64	1.86*	.75
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	23	1.87*	.69	66	2.09*	.74	64	1.95*	.63
Administration Subscale Totals	**24**	**2.01***	**.46**	**66**	**2.08***	**.38**	**64**	**2.04***	**.33**

Table 28 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Years as a Principal

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	10> Years			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	106	1.79*	.51	3,256	1.43	.236
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	106	1.77*	.56	3,256	.59	.622
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	106	1.87*	.59	3,256	1.57	.198
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	106	2.05*	.59	3,256	.78	.504
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	106	2.52*	1.01	3,256	.73	.537
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	106	2.66*	.92	3,256	.16	.923
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	106	1.92*	.47	3,256	.35	.788
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	105	1.78*	.55	3,255	.28	.842
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	105	1.87*	.50	3,255	.30	.826
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	104	2.07*	.67	3,254	.62	.603
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	105	1.91*	.59	3,255	1.21	.305
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	105	1.88*	.76	3,255	2.24	.084
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	105	1.96*	.73	3,254	.78	.506
Administration Subscale Totals	**106**	**2.00***	**.41**	**3,256**	**.61**	**.336**

Table 29

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Years as a Principal (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-1 Years			2-4 Years			5-9 Years		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	24	3.17*	.87	65	2.97*	1.05	64	2.89*	.94
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	24	3.08*	.83	66	3.08*	.90	64	3.05*	.95
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	24	3.13*	1.03	66	2.55*	1.00	64	2.98*	.88
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	24	3.04*	.91	66	2.98*	.97	64	3.06*	.92
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	24	1.88*	.54	66	1.80*	.64	64	1.92*	.63
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	24	2.29*	1.00	66	2.35*	.87	64	2.59*	1.06
Resource Allocation Subscale	**24**	**2.76***	**.53**	**66**	**2.62***	**.49**	**64**	**2.75***	**.56**

Table 29 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Years as a Principal

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	10> Years			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	104	3.26*	.91	3,253	2.43	.066
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	105	3.15*	.96	3,255	.19	.898
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	105	2.95*	1.01	3,255	3.49	.016
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	106	3.09*	1.00	3,256	.18	.912
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	106	1.91*	.59	3,256	.52	.671
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	106	2.39*	.82	3,256	1.11	.347
Resource Allocation Subscale	**106**	**2.79**	**.59**	**3,256**	**1.40**	**.244**

deviations, and ANOVAs for the resource allocation subscale as it relates to principal's years as an administrator.

Perceived effects on instruction. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the instruction subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' years of experience on perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(3,256)=1.291$, $p=.278$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 30 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the instruction subscale as it relates to principal's years as an administrator.

Research Question 7

Is there a relationship between a principal's amount of prior standards/assessment/accountability training and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Perceived effects on teachers. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the teacher subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=2.064$, $p=.086$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 31 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs as it relates to a principal's amount of standards/assessment/accountability training.

Table 30

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Years as a Principal (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	0-1 Years			2-4 Years			5-9 Years		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	24	3.38*	.71	66	3.17*	.92	64	3.28*	.86
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	24	3.42*	.78	66	3.41*	.96	64	3.61*	.77
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	24	2.50*	.78	66	2.62*	.89	63	2.75*	.97
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	24	3.46*	.78	66	3.65*	.81	64	3.61*	.75
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	24	2.83*	.96	66	2.74*	.95	64	2.77*	.89
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	24	2.96	.91	66	3.15	.92	64	3.36	.84
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	23	3.04	.82	65	3.06	.86	64	3.28	.83
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	24	2.46	.59	66	2.59	.74	64	2.63	.81
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	24	2.79*	.93	66	2.92*	1.09	64	3.08*	1.15
Instruction Subscale Totals	**24**	**2.98***	**.44**	**66**	**3.04***	**.51**	**64**	**3.15***	**.47**

Table 30 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Years as a Principal

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	10> Years			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	df	F	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	106	3.25*	.94	3,256	.37	.776
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	106	3.51*	.92	3,256	.64	.592
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	106	2.83*	.96	3,255	1.21	.308
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	106	3.75*	.75	3,256	1.17	.320
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	106	2.92*	.97	3,256	.64	.589
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	106	3.42*	.91	3,256	2.43	.065
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	105	3.13*	.86	3,253	.88	.543
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	105	2.53*	.79	3,255	.37	.773
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	106	2.93*	.93	3,256	.54	.653
Instruction Subscale Totals	**106**	**3.14***	**.52**	**3,256**	**1.29**	**.278**

Table 31

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Amount of Principal Training (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	None			A Little			Some		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	16	2.19	.75	63	2.03	.84	113	2.17	.75
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	16	1.56*	.51	63	1.70*	.50	113	1.84*	.61
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	16	2.75*	1.13	62	2.53*	.86	112	2.80*	1.00
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	16	3.50	.82	63	3.60	.91	113	3.78	.66
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	16	3.44	.73	62	3.37	.87	112	3.43	.81
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	16	3.06*	.87	63	3.02*	.91	112	3.21*	.86
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	16	1.69*	.48	63	1.62*	.61	113	1.80*	.76
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	16	1.69*	.48	63	1.62*	.52	113	1.75*	.66
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	16	2.19*	.91	61	2.26*	.87	111	2.50*	.84
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	16	1.94*	.77	63	2.21*	1.00	113	2.56*	.97
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	16	3.13	1.09	63	3.35	1.03	112	3.56	.80
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	16	2.00*	.52	63	1.97*	.65	113	2.02*	.48
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	16	1.56*	.51	63	1.65*	.74	113	1.57*	.53
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	16	1.69	.48	63	1.78	.71	113	1.73	.56
Teacher Subscale Totals	**16**	**2.31***	**.48**	**63**	**2.34***	**.38**	**113**	**2.48***	**.38**

Table 31 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Teacher Subscale by Amount of Principal Training

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Quite a Bit			Extensive			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.	61	2.41	1.02	8	2.50	1.07	4,256	1.82	.126
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.	61	1.97*	.89	8	1.88*	.99	4,256	1.88	.114
2.3 Teachers will resign early (citing standards as a reason).	60	2.67*	.99	8	3.00*	1.07	4,253	.98	.418
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.	60	3.67	.84	8	2.88	1.55	4,255	2.69	.031
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.	61	3.51	.92	8	2.75	1.39	4,254	1.39	.238
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.	61	3.28*	.92	8	3.88*	.83	4,255	2.08	.084
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.	61	1.92*	.59	8	1.88*	.99	4,256	1.64	.164
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.	60	1.88*	.64	8	1.63*	.74	4,255	1.52	.197
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.	60	2.57*	.95	8	2.75*	1.39	4,251	1.59	.178
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.	61	2.49*	1.03	8	3.00*	1.41	4,256	2.94	.021
2.11 There will be a group of teachers who fully support the movement.	61	3.46	.98	8	3.13	1.13	4,255	1.32	.262
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.	61	2.05*	.59	8	1.75*	.71	4,256	.59	.669
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.	61	1.69*	.62	8	1.38*	.52	4,256	.79	.532
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.	61	1.84	.61	8	1.75	.71	4,256	.40	.810
Teacher Subscale Totals	**61**	**2.53***	**.50**	**8**	**2.44***	**.82**	**4,256**	**2.06**	**.086**

Perceived effects on students. On the student subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=1.459$, $p=.215$). Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for one question were statistically significant. Question 3.7 revealed that principals with no training were significantly less likely than those with either some or quite a bit of training to perceive that students will learn more due to state standards. Table 32 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the student subscale as it relates to a principal's amount of standards/assessment/accountability training.

Perceived effects on administration. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the administration subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=1.922$, $p=.107$). Further investigation on the individual questions using ANOVA with the Tukey pairwise comparison follow-up tests within this subset revealed the mean scores for two questions were statistically significant. Question 4.7 revealed that principals who had received extensive training on standards were significantly more likely than those who had no or some training to perceive principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports. Question 4.9 revealed that principals who had received extensive training were significantly more likely to perceive principals will be asked to plan and develop even

Table 32

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Amount of Principal Training (Continued on next page)

	None			A Little			Some		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	16	3.19	.91	63	3.02	.96	113	3.19	.92
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	16	2.81	.83	63	2.56	.71	113	2.60	.75
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	16	3.19	.91	62	2.97	.94	113	2.94	.94
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	16	2.31	.87	63	2.70	.91	113	2.83	.79
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	16	2.38	.96	63	2.81	.95	113	2.96	.82
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	16	2.94	1.06	63	2.89	.95	113	3.04	.82
3.7 Students will learn more.	16	2.25	.63	63	2.68	.96	113	2.94	.77
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	16	2.88	1.02	63	3.24	.87	113	3.24	.87
Student Subscale Totals	**16**	**2.74**	**.58**	**63**	**2.86**	**.64**	**113**	**2.97**	**.51**

Table 32 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Student Subscale by Amount of Principal Training

	Quite a Bit			Extensive			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.	61	3.36	.91	8	2.88	1.13	4,256	1.27	.282
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.	61	2.54	.87	8	2.25	.89	4,256	.79	.533
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.	61	2.82	.94	8	3.00	1.07	4,255	.55	.703
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.	61	3.00	.89	8	2.75	1.17	4,256	2.37	.053
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.	61	2.98	1.01	8	2.88	1.13	4,256	1.73	.144
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.	61	3.25	.85	8	3.00	1.20	4,256	1.33	.259
3.7 Students will learn more.	61	3.10	.85	8	2.88	1.25	4,256	4.12	.003
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.	60	3.25	.73	8	2.75	1.17	4,255	1.26	.287
Student Subscale Totals	**61**	**3.04**	**.54**	**8**	**2.80**	**.83**	**4,256**	**1.46**	**.215**

more effective in-services for teachers in the area of standards/assessment/accountability than principals who had none, a little and some training. Also, principals who had quite a bit of training were also more likely to perceive this than those with no training. Table 33 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the administration subscale as it relates to a principal's amount of standards/assessment/accountability training.

Perceived effects on resource allocation. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the resource allocation subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=2.062$, $p=.086$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 34 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the resource allocation subscale as it relates to a principal's amount of standards/assessment/accountability training.

Perceived effects on instruction. On the subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the effects of standards implementation on the instruction subscale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=2.681$, $p=.032$). Further investigation on the individual questions also revealed no significance. Table 35 presents the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and ANOVAs for the instruction subscale as it relates to a principal's amount of standards/assessment/accountability training.

Table 33

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Amount of Principal Training (Continued on next page) * Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	None			A Little			Some		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	16	1.81*	.40	63	1.78*	.66	113	1.90*	.55
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	16	1.88*	.50	63	1.81*	.50	113	1.82*	.54
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	16	1.94*	.44	63	1.95*	.63	113	1.92*	.48
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	16	2.25*	.45	63	2.05*	.55	113	2.08*	.55
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	16	2.44*	.89	63	2.44*	1.06	113	2.68*	1.03
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	16	2.44*	.96	63	2.43*	.96	113	2.70*	.90
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	16	2.13*	.34	63	1.87*	.42	113	1.96*	.40
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	16	1.81*	.40	63	1.83*	.73	112	1.85*	.54
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	16	2.13*	.72	63	1.84*	.55	112	1.91*	.39
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	16	2.31*	.79	63	2.05*	.61	111	2.19*	.67
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	16	2.06*	.77	63	1.92*	.55	112	2.02*	.52
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	16	1.88*	.50	63	1.87*	.71	112	2.03*	.76
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	16	2.13*	.72	63	1.86*	.67	112	2.04*	.70
Administration Subscale Totals	**16**	**2.09***	**.22**	**63**	**1.98***	**.42**	**113**	**2.08***	**.37**

Table 33 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVAs Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Administration Subscale by Amount of Principal Training

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Quite a Bit			Extensive			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.	61	1.85*	.48	8	1.75*	.71	4,256	.59	.668
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.	61	1.79*	.41	8	1.75*	1.04	4,256	.14	.969
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications...	61	1.89*	.45	8	1.38*	.52	4,256	2.31	.059
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.	61	1.97*	.55	8	1.63*	.74	4,256	2.12	.078
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).	61	2.64*	.91	8	2.63*	1.30	4,256	.68	.605
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.	61	2.69*	.98	8	2.63*	1.30	4,256	1.06	.375
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports...	61	1.82*	.43	8	1.50*	.53	4,256	.40	.002
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.	61	1.77*	.53	8	1.63*	.52	4,255	.40	.810
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide instructional leadership...	61	1.74*	.48	8	1.25*	.46	4,255	5.74	<.0005
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation...	61	2.10*	.65	8	1.75*	1.04	4,254	1.43	.226
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop ...effective inservices for teachers...	61	1.84*	.49	8	1.63*	.74	4,255	2.01	.093
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.	61	2.00*	.91	8	1.50*	.53	4,255	1.21	.307
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.	60	1.97*	.64	8	2.00*	1.41	4,254	.41	.820
Administration Subscale Totals	**61**	**2.00***	**.38**	**8**	**2.00***	**.38**	**4,256**	**1.92**	**.107**

Table 34

Means, Standard Deviations, and Individual Items Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Amount of Principal Training (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	None			A Little			Some		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	16	3.31*	1.01	63	3.03*	.93	110	3.08*	.94
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	16	2.81*	.75	63	2.83*	.91	112	3.21*	.89
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	16	2.69*	1.01	63	2.68*	1.08	112	2.99*	.92
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	16	2.38*	.72	63	2.98*	.98	113	3.16*	.91
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	16	2.13*	.72	63	1.76*	.53	113	1.90*	.58
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	16	2.25*	.77	63	2.29*	.89	113	2.43*	.91
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**16**	**2.59***	**.41**	**63**	**2.60***	**.53**	**113**	**2.80***	**.51**

Table 34 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and Individual Items Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Resource Allocation Subscale by Amount of Principal Training

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Quite a Bit			Extensive			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	Df	F	p
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).	61	3.11*	1.00	8	2.75*	1.17	4,253	.53	.717
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.	61	3.25*	.96	8	3.00*	1.20	4,255	2.66	.033
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).	61	2.90*	1.04	8	2.63*	1.06	4,255	1.24	.295
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.	61	3.13*	.99	8	2.88*	1.25	4,256	2.66	.033
5.5 Textbook/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/ local content standards.	61	1.90*	.62	8	1.75*	1.04	4,256	1.40	.234
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/ accountability movement such as testing will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.	61	2.54*	.98	8	2.50*	1.20	4,256	.75	.556
Resource Allocation Subscale Totals	**61**	**2.81***	**.61**	**8**	**2.58***	**.98**	**4,256**	**2.06**	**.086**

Table 35

Means, Standard Deviations, and Individual Items Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Amount of Principal Training (Continued on next page)

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	None			A Little			Some		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	16	2.94*	.86	63	3.02*	.92	113	3.35*	.83
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	16	3.38*	.89	63	3.33*	.93	113	3.60*	.80
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	16	2.69*	.79	63	2.49*	.88	113	2.73*	.90
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	16	3.50*	.97	63	3.76*	.69	113	3.60*	.77
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	16	2.69*	.79	63	2.52*	.93	113	2.91*	.90
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	16	3.38	1.15	63	3.10	.93	113	3.31	.85
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	16	3.06	.85	61	3.07	.87	112	3.14	.81
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	16	2.75	.77	62	2.32	.74	113	2.60	.73
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	16	2.63*	1.20	63	2.86*	1.05	113	3.04*	.97
Instruction Subscale Totals	**16**	**3.00***	**.41**	**63**	**2.94***	**.50**	**113**	**3.14***	**.44**

Table 35 Continued

Means, Standard Deviations, and Individual Items Related to Principals' Perceptions of the Effects of Standards Implementation on the Instruction Subscale by Amount of Principal Training

* Asterisk denotes recoded mean

	Quite a Bit			Extensive			ANOVA		
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	df	F	p
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.	61	3.38*	.90	8	3.13*	1.25	4,256	2.34	.056
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.	61	3.48*	.96	8	3.50*	1.31	4,256	1.00	.410
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated.	60	2.88*	1.04	8	3.13*	1.13	4,255	1.80	.129
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.	61	3.75*	.72	8	3.38*	1.19	4,256	1.11	.351
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.	61	2.93*	1.01	8	3.38*	1.06	4,256	2.86	.024
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.	61	3.43	.88	8	3.25	1.17	4,256	1.13	.344
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.	61	3.26	.85	8	2.88	1.13	4,253	.66	.620
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.	61	2.70	.80	8	2.25	.89	4,255	2.76	.028
6.9 The standards/assessment/ accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.	61	3.05*	1.02	8	2.50*	1.07	4,256	1.27	.283
Instruction Subscale Totals	**61**	**3.21***	**.57**	**8**	**3.04***	**.81**	**4,256**	**2.68**	**.032**

Total. On the total scale, there was no statistically significant difference across principals' amount of training and perceptions of how Nebraska state standards will impact schools ($F(4,256)=2.870$, $p=.024$).

This study's many statistically significant results and revelations will certainly be of interest to those interested in the Nebraska state standards/assessment/accountability movement. Chapter 5 will discuss and interpret these findings.

Chapter 5

Discussion, Recommendations, and Summary

Discussion

This study examined Nebraska high school principals' perceptions of how state standards will impact their schools. Data were gathered through a written survey modified from Johnson (1981) and Duke, et al., (2000) instrument to fit the current standards/assessment/accountability movement in Nebraska. All 293 Nebraska public high school principals were initially asked to participate in this study. Two hundred and sixty-one surveys were returned (89%). The variables measured were (a) gender, (b) age, (c) percent of free/reduced lunches, (d) school enrollment (NSAA classification), (e) years as an administrator, and (f) amount of standards/assessment/accountability training. Statistical analyses included descriptive statistics, t-tests, and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs).

Several statistically significant findings were revealed through the various analyses. When analyzing the subscales, it was found that the size of the school's enrollment is related to a principal's perceptions of how state standards will impact schools. On individual question analyses, 13 questions revealed significant differences.

After examining all of the statistical tests and analyses in Chapter 4, eight main themes emerged. The eight themes are:

1. Overall, principals' perceived that standards would have little impact except in the areas of administration, stress, pressure, and time.

2. Principals' perceptions were similar regardless of gender, age, years as an administrator, amount of training, or school's free/reduced lunch percentage.
3. The perceptions of principals in Class A schools differed from those of principals in smaller schools.
4. Principals perceived the state standards/assessment/accountability will create a greater demand on educators' time.
5. Principals perceived the state standards/assessment/accountability movement will create added stress and pressure for educators.
6. Principals didn't appear convinced that the implementation of state standards will have a major impact on student learning.
7. Principals were in general agreement that future textbooks and materials purchases will be based on how well the content matches state or local content standards.
8. Principals with no training in standards/assessment/accountability had different views from those with varying degrees of training in the areas of student learning and principals' roles in interpreting accountability reports and providing further instructional leadership due to standards.

Each of the studies eight themes helps answer the seven research questions of this study:

1. What are the possible effects of Nebraska state standards as perceived by principals?
2. Is there a difference between male and female principal perceptions of

how the Nebraska state standards will impact their schools?

3. Is there a relationship between a principal's age and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
4. Is there a relationship between a principal's school's free and reduced lunch percentage and his/her perception of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
5. Is there a relationship between school enrollment and a principal's perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
6. Is there a relationship between a principal's years as an administrator and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?
7. Is there a relationship between a principal's amount of prior standards/assessment/accountability training and his/her perceptions of how the Nebraska state standards will impact his/her school?

Theme 1: Principal Neutrality

Overall, principals' perceived that standards would have little impact except in the areas of administration, stress, pressure, and time.

This survey utilized a 5-point Likert scale where mean scores closest to 3.0 were considered neutral. Questions with average mean scores above 4.0 (agree) or below 2.0 (disagree) were considered to be responses about which respondents had the strongest thoughts and feelings. Of the 50 survey items, only 16 mean scores

differed, on average, one point or more from the neutral score. Of these 16, nine were found in the subscale measuring principals' perceptions of the impact standard implementation will have on administration practice. This main theme and finding will first be examined by looking at the subscales not dealing with the topic of administration.

On one level, finding many neutral scores was not expected. When this study was initiated, it was anticipated that many Nebraska high school principals would feel strongly about the state's standards/assessment/accountability movement due to the extent to which it would change their own work lives. These initial thoughts came from various interactions with principals. In fact, the impetus for this research study came from a discussion of the topic in an Omaha-metropolitan area principals' meeting. At this meeting, held at the University of Nebraska at Omaha in November 2000, principals were very adamant about their concerns of what standards might do to their schools. Additionally, when some of the surveys were initially distributed in Kearney, Nebraska, at the state's annual convention for school principals, many principals took the survey and made comments about how they wanted to use the survey as a vehicle to share their strong opinions on this issue.

In addition, this paper's literature review described how this topic has become very politically charged and has been the focal point of countless debates. Proponents and opponents of the standards movement have debated everything about the standards movement from what standards are to when the movement started to why standards exist to the possibility of standards affecting student achievement. With so many questions that draw interest and no clear-cut answers, it is clear that this topic

has the potential to ignite very strong opinions. So, the question remains as to why this survey did not generate strong emotions among the principals.

On another level, the neutral mean scores might be seen as an expected response to a reform movement in its initial phases. Since the assessment phase of Nebraska's standards was just beginning at the time this survey was distributed, principals could only guess at how standards would impact their individual schools. They didn't know if their district would require expensive academic test-prep centers, or the cutting of elective curriculums, or some other measures districts typically have taken across the country in response to their schools' scores. Principals could only hypothesize how the new assessment system would impact their schools; perhaps this is why many of the mean scores did not waver far from neutral.

The subscale dealing with principals' perceptions of the impact standards will have on administration revealed the most opinionated responses. On the 13-question subscale, nine questions revealed a response of at least one full average mean point from the neutral score. Again, responses further from the neutral mean average were expected. This study was initiated the same week the first state writing results were made public in the *Omaha World-Herald* (Matczak & Goodsell, 2001). As school principals learned more about the standards movement, their schools' placement in the state and reactions to these scores by community and/or superiors, unknowns became known quantities. Whether or not a principal knew what impact standards would have on teachers, students, resource allocation, or instruction, he or she began to see how standards would impact his or her role in the school.

The fact that the questions on the administration subscale also revealed the lowest overall standard deviation score further indicates that principals are generally in agreement about how standards/assessment/accountability will impact their roles. They would lilely agree that standards/assessment/accountability is going to put a larger demand on their time and create greater pressure. This finding supports the current education research on this topic (Johnson et al., 2000; Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Jones, 2000; Lashway, 2000; Lockwood, 1998; Stiggins, 2001).

Theme 2: Principal Similarity

Principals' perceptions were similar regardless of gender, age, years as an administrator, amount of training, or school's free/reduced lunch percentage. A total of 250 individual tests were conducted. Only five individual questions revealed a significant difference among the groups analyzed: gender, age, years as an administrator, amount of training, or school's free/reduced lunch percentage. This finding answers research questions two, three, four, six and seven.

This finding was expected on some of the subscales and unexpected on others. It was expected that there would not be any statistically significant differences when examining principals' measures of gender, age, years as an administrator, or amount of training. It was expected a school's free/reduced lunch percentage to reveal some statistically significant differences.

Similar perceptions by principals in the areas of gender, age, years as an administrator and amount of training was expected because of the nature of the state standards movement. Expectations of stakeholders in the various communities will not change with the principal's background; therefore, the same challenges and tasks

will exist for every principal. Principals, no matter what their backgrounds, are going to be required to learn the same number of tasks associated with the implementation of state standards/assessment/accountability, such as administering the tests correctly, interpreting the test scores, helping teachers become assessment literate, leading teachers in realigning local curriculum to state standards, arranging appropriate staff development activities, understanding the kind of environment that promotes student achievement, providing the right kind of leadership, and encouraging change.

When encouraging change, all Nebraska principals will again be in the same situation, regardless of their of gender, age, years as an administrator, amount of training, or school's free/reduced lunch percentage. The Nebraska state standards movement for each school represents an initial stage of the change process. School organizations and their stakeholders, as Kurt Lewin's (1951a; 1951b) Change Theory suggests, have to go through a process during which each of the three steps associated with change occur: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. The Nebraska state standards movement is in the process of moving from unfreezing to changing. As is the case with any change in a school, all eyes go to the principal for direction and guidance in this process (Lashway, 2000). Managing and successfully implementing this change will be a difficult task as people, naturally, prefer predictable routines, and like to remain stable and rely on the familiar (Evans, 1996; Schein, 2001).

The unexpected finding was the absence of differences between principals of schools with varying percentages of students on free or reduced lunch programs. Schools with historically low socioeconomic student bodies have often scored lower than their more affluent neighbors on tests and other assessments. In fact, Kohn

(2001) has written that standardized assessments and tests are an incredibly effective measure for determining the size of the houses near the school where the test is being administered rather than for determining the effectiveness of schools. Because of this, it might be expected that principals in schools with a high free/reduced lunch population would show concern over having their scores reported on an annual basis and compared to more affluent schools throughout the state.

Theme 3: Class A Principal Differences

The perceptions of principals in Class A schools differed from those of principals in smaller schools. This finding helps answer research question 2 by indicating a relationship between school enrollment and a principals' perceptions exist. Specifically, Class A principals were statistically less likely than Class C and D principals to perceive that:

- the stress level among teachers would increase,
- teachers would have more workshops to attend,
- record keeping would be an increasing concern for teachers, and
- principals would have more workshops to attend.

Class A principals were statistically more likely than Class B, C, and D principals to perceive that:

- teachers would not have more committee work responsibilities,
- more students who need assistance would be identified, and
- students would learn more.

When examining these responses, it appears that Class A principals were less concerned than their smaller school counterparts that standards will create more

stress-inducing and time-consuming tasks. Furthermore, Class A principals were more likely to perceive state standards will help students learn more and increase the likelihood of students becoming identified if assistance is needed. It is tempting to say Class A principals were somewhat more enthusiastic about the standards' system.

However, while it appears from these findings that principals from Class A schools appeared more positive than those from the other classes, their mean scores on each of the questions does not indicate overwhelming support or rejection. In fact, when examining the mean scores of Class A principals for each question, only one question apart from those dealing with administration had an average mean score of more than one point different from a neutral score of 3.0. While Class A principals appeared to be more supportive of standards than the other principals, their scores should not be construed as strong support or rejection of the standards movement. Their perceptions on the questions where significance was found could be considered as neutral while the responses of principals from smaller schools could be considered somewhat negative.

This difference based on school size was expected because of what has been written in the literature pertaining to small schools and the standards/assessment/accountability movement. The literature suggests that small schools typically have fewer resources and tend to lack district-level support from individuals such as directors of assessment when implementing this change (Harmon & Branham, 1999).

Theme 4: Greater Demand on Time

Principals generally perceived that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement will create a greater demand on educators' time. On the 50 question survey, approximately 15 questions dealt with the issue of time either directly or indirectly. Of these 15 questions, 80% yielded a score of over one full point away from neutral. This finding made it clear that principals did perceive state standards will increase demands on their time.

This finding was expected because a great deal of the literature on standards/assessment/accountability focuses on the enormous time demands and tasks that are required of teachers and administrators. Specifically, the literature on this topic describes how teachers will spend as much as one third of their work life on assessment related activities (Stiggins, 2001). They need time for adequate training (Angaran, 1999; Falk, 2000; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000), to align curriculum to standards (Berman et al., 2000; Bezy, 1999; Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000; McColskey & McMunn, 2000), to develop fair assessments to measure achievement of the standards (Berman et al., 2000), to create standards-compatible instructional activities (Bezy, 1999), to develop practice tests (Bezy, 1999), to work as a full faculty to conduct a review of the assessment results at the end of the year (Schmoker & Marzano, 1999), to learn to administer the tests (Harrington-Lueker, 2000), and to form teams to identify areas of strengths, weaknesses, and clarity on various issues (McColskey & McMunn, 2000; Schmoker & Marzano, 1999).

The literature also identifies the many time-consuming tasks that will be required of administrators. These include administering the tests correctly, reading

the scores, helping teachers become assessment literate, leading teachers in realigning local curriculum to state standards, arranging appropriate staff development activities, understanding the kind of environment that promotes student achievement, providing the right kind of leadership, communicating to the public, and managing the change process (Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Jones, 2000; Lashway, 2000; Lockwood, 1998; Stiggins, 2001).

Theme 5: Greater Stress and Pressure

Principals perceived that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement will create added stress and pressure for educators. Two questions on this survey specifically addressed this issue. The questions asked (1) if the stress level among teachers would increase and (2) if principals would be under greater pressure. In each case, an average mean score that denotes "strongly agree" was recorded.

This finding was expected because of the national trends in response to the standards/assessment/accountability movement. Many states have gone to a ranking system for schools and have created an atmosphere where the pressure to raise test scores is tremendous. The negative reactions of some school personnel with regard to this high-stakes environment has been well documented. In the year 2000, there were multiple incidents of teachers and administrators cheating in order to receive high scores and various school officials across the nation have been placed on probation or fired for this practice (Clarke, 2000; Harrington-Lueker, 2000; Wallace, 2000). With information like this in the national press, it was expected Nebraska high school principals might feel stressed about this reform movement.

Theme 6: Student Learning Debate Unanswered

Principals didn't appear to be convinced that state standards will have a major impact on student learning. The very reason standards exist is for the positive impact they are intended to have on student learning (Mathers, 2001). However, this survey reveals that Nebraska high school principals are not entirely convinced this result will occur. There were three questions on the survey that dealt with this issue in a direct fashion and each revealed findings that were very close to neutral. The three questions asked if:

- there will be a significant improvement in student achievement (M=2.80, SD=.87),
- students will learn more (M=2.87, SD=.88), and
- the reform movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement (M=3.05, SD=1.02).

These neutral findings were expected. One of the reasons for the heavy debate on standards is that no study has been able to clearly show that standards are directly responsible for increases in student learning. In fact, Nave, et al. (2000) argue that only one such study has attempted to do this and it had only one small sample size consisting of one teacher, three classes of students, and one school. Proponents of standards might argue with this fact and cite that there are many examples of schools, districts, and states where students raised their scores over a period of time after initially implementing standards. Critics, however, contend that there is no evidence that standards themselves did anything to improve the quality of

the learning process; therefore, whether or not student learning was affected was not determined (McColskey & McMunn, 2000).

Theme 7: Future Textbook and Material Purchases

Principals were in general agreement that future textbooks and materials purchases will be based on how well the content matches state standards or local content standards.

This finding was expected. In November of 2001, the State's report card for schools changed and began to provide various types of data for each school, giving schools a rating ranging from "excellent" to "unacceptable". The items that were graded included the assessment plans, the percentage of students who met the standard, success with groups of students who did not typically do well in school, and improvement. School districts received a "school performance rating" based on how they scored on the multiple criteria. This enabled schools to see how individual school scores compared to the state aggregate (Reid, 2001; Roschewski et al., 2001).

When reports to the public indicate the percentage of students who meet a given standard, it can be expected that curriculum developers will try to ensure that the textbooks and materials being used will match what is being measured. In fact, standards' authors have written about the interconnectivity of standards/assessment/accountability and have indicated that textbooks could easily be considered the fourth feature between the standards and assessment (Meier, 2000). While Nebraska's standards will not likely influence textbook publishers like those in larger states such as Texas, California, or New York, it can be expected that

Nebraska's local districts will make sure the textbooks and materials they purchase will be from those companies whose materials most closely match their needs.

Theme 8: Differences Related to Training

Principals with no training regarding state standards had different perceptions from those with varying degrees of training in the areas of student learning, principals' roles in interpreting accountability reports and principals' roles in providing further instructional leadership due to standards. Specifically, principals with no training were less likely at a statistically significant level than those with higher levels of training to perceive that:

- students will learn more,
- principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports due to standards/assessment/accountability, and
- principals will be asked to provide additional instructional leadership due to standards/assessment/accountability.

Principals who have had some levels of training were significantly more positive in perceiving that students will ultimately learn more due to standards/assessment/accountability. However, while scores were higher for principals that had received some training, the overall scores were close to neutral for each group of principals based on amount of training.

Some might look at these results and indicate that principals who haven't had any formal training may simply be naive on the issues. Because this movement is in its initial phases, perhaps those with no training do not yet have a grasp on what their role will be in the future. Those who have had training may understand that, in all

likelihood, principals will be expected to have a major role in interpreting accountability reports for stakeholders and providing additional leadership. In fact, these are the very things principals may have learned about in their training sessions.

Recommendations for Practice

It is important to understand how high school principals are responding to current standards/assessment/accountability initiatives (Duke, et al., 2000). Information from such studies enables policy-makers to consider the impact standards might have on schools and to help explain why some schools and districts fare better than others (Duke, et al., 2000). Based on results of this study, state policy makers may consider three possible recommendations.

Additional Support to Smaller School Principals

Profile questions were divided into six categories: gender, age, school's free/reduced lunch rate, school enrollment, years as an administrator, and amount of training. Of these, only one subscale revealed significant differences in scores among any of the variables measured: the size of a principal's school's enrollment. Many other individual questions in the subscale also showed similar results. Because Class A schools scored the highest in all subscales, it might be important to determine strategies that would benefit principals from schools with smaller enrollments.

Additionally, analyses of the individual questions revealed that in many cases, the principals from smaller class schools were more concerned about issues impacting time and stress than were large school principals. Currently, the main differences between Class A principals and those from Classes B, C, and D is that Class A schools often have directors and other professionals who are responsible for

managing assessment. A possible solution that could benefit the small school principals would be to provide service area consultants and/or assessment directors with funding from the S.T.A.R.S. grant. These support people would be responsible for managing assessment practices in multiple school districts. In this type of arrangement, small school principals would be able to have a similar role in the assessment process similar to that of as their large school counterparts. While some of these things are already taking place, further measures may want to be considered.

Efforts to Change Neutral Perceptions

Principals' perceptions of standards were neutral on most questions. On a positive note, principals were not overly negative to questions about standards, but they were not overly positive. Those involved with the state standards/assessment/accountability movement in Nebraska may want to determine strategies to help turn luke-warm perceptions into positive ones. The success of this reform movement will be based on how well teachers and administrators implement the system, consequently, it would be beneficial to have a leader who believes in the movement. In order to do this, state leaders of the reform movement may want to determine strategies for to assisting and providing additional support to principals. For instance, through local in-services, state leaders could help principals understand why this reform movement came about, why it is needed, and how it could potentially impact students. In addition, state leaders could train principals in strategies for communicating this and other important information to teachers and community members.

Formal Training at University Level

This study indicated that those with training were more likely to perceive standards would have a positive impact on student learning, Nebraska officials may want to consider requiring a course focusing on Nebraska standards as part of the formal course work requirement for prospective principals. The coursework could concentrate on the following topics and activities:

- History of standards
- National, state and local perspectives of standards
- Arguments presented by proponents and opponents
- Practice in interpreting results of Nebraska's reporting system
- Strategies for providing reports to stakeholders whether the reports are positive or negative
- Strategies for working with curriculum departments as they attempt to match or create local content standards with the state's standards

In learning this background and important strategies, principals would likely feel much more at ease when working with standards.

Recommendations for Future Research

While this produced a number of findings that will be valuable to stakeholders across the state, a few key considerations should be noted for future researchers examining this topic.

Clear and Specific Wording

One possible modification of the study would be to change the wording of some of the questions to be more clear and specific. Perhaps the best example of this

comes from the profile section of the survey that asked principals to check a box indicating the amount of training they have had received on the topic of standards/assessment/accountability. This question relied on principals to determine the appropriate classification for their own amount of training. Differences in perceptions regarding training surely existed. For example, some might have viewed a one-hour presentation at a conference as being extensive training while another might have viewed the same presentation as insignificant. These probable differences may make it difficult to examine this research question with any degree of accuracy. Follow-up studies using similar surveys could use specific examples of training to solicit responses. These examples could help principals with similar levels of training to consistently mark the same levels on the survey.

Other Grade Levels

This study concentrated on the perceptions of high school principals. By design, no information was collected regarding perceptions of elementary or middle school principals. It would be informative to compare the responses of principals across the various levels to find differences and similarities.

Follow-up Study

A follow-up study would also be valuable. It would be important to note the impact time has on the overall mean for each of the subscales and individual questions. Continued negative or neutral scores could sound an alarm for policy makers that may influence possible changes to be considered. Conversely, positive scores could help indicate progress on the road to success for Nebraska's unique assessment process.

Study in Other States

This survey study, with modest revisions to fit a state's needs, could easily be replicated in most states in the United States. State school chiefs could gain valuable information about their states' standards/assessment/accountability process by giving this or a similar survey to principals at all levels of leadership. A state could discover areas for which additional training is needed and provide for the necessary proactive measures.

Concluding Statement

The purpose of this survey study was to test whether principals perceive state standards will greatly impact schools in the state of Nebraska. All public schools registered with the state department in the state of Nebraska are and will continue to be heavily involved in the standards movement due to Nebraska Legislative Bill 812, passed in the spring of 2000. This bill, which calls for a school-based and teacher led assessment process, requires each local school district to develop its own standards and assessment tools, report annually on students' progress on locally developed standards, and to annually participate in a state-wide writing assessment (Roschewski, Gallagher, & Isernhagen, 2001). The study examined principal perceptions of how these standards will impact their schools and looked for various demographic differences in the sample studied.

While using descriptive analyses, T-tests, and ANOVAs, numerous statistically significant findings were revealed. Specifically, eight themes were discovered:

- Overall, principals' perceived that standards would have little impact except in the areas of administration, stress, pressure, and time.
- Principals' perceptions were similar regardless of gender, age, years as an administrator, amount of training, or school's free/reduced lunch percentage.
- The perceptions of principals in Class A schools differed from those of principals in smaller schools.
- Principals perceived the state standards/assessment/accountability will create a greater demand on educators' time.
- Principals perceived the state standards/assessment/accountability movement will create added stress and pressure for educators.
- Principals didn't appear convinced that the implementation of state standards will have a major impact on student learning.
- Principals were in general agreement that future textbooks and materials purchases will be based on how well the content matches state or local content standards.
- Principals with no training in standards/assessment/accountability had different views from those with varying degrees of training in the areas of student learning and principals' roles in interpreting accountability reports and providing further instructional leadership due to standards.

The information from these themes should be seen as valuable not only to principals across the state who are responsible for implementing standards, but also to those at the state level who make decisions in regard to how they are implemented.

References

Abbott, J. (1997). To be intelligent. Educational Leadership, 54(6), 6-10.

Allen, J. D., & Dietrich, A. (1991, April). Student differences in attribution and motivation toward the study of high school regents earth science. Chicago, IL: The American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 338 482)

American Educational Research Association (1999). AERA position statement: High-stakes testing in preK-12 education [Brochure]. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Anderman, E. (1992). Motivation and cognitive strategy used in reading and writing. San Francisco, CA: National Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 374 402)

Angaran, J. (1999). Reflection in an age of assessment. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 56(6), 71-72.

ASCD. (2001, May 23). House backs annual testing plan. ASCD Smartbrief. Retrieved May 23, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://lw4fd.law4.hotmail.msn.com/cgibin/getmsg?curmbox=F000000001&a=d196eccbd4afda9115eb94085bbf9494&msg=MSG990644315.18&start=2042959&len=49586&msgread=1

Bacon, M. (1999). Student perceptions of the implementation of standards-based education. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Barr, M. (2000). Looking at the learning record. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 57(5), 20-23.

Bauman, P. (1996). Governing education: Public sector reform or privatization? Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bellevue Board of Education. (2001, February, 5). Monthly school board meeting packet. Bellevue, NE: Bellevue Public Schools.

Berkson, W. (1997). A place to stand: Breaking the impasse over standards. Phi Delta Kappan, 79(3), 207-211.

Berlew, D. & Hall, D. (1966). The socialization of managers: Effects of expectations on performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11(2), 207-223.

Berliner, D. (2001, January, 28). Our schools vs. theirs: Averages that hide the true extremes. The Washington Post. Retrieved January 15, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://washingtonpost.com

Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1995). The manufactured crises. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Berman, I., Cross, C., & Evans, J. (2000). Results count in Los Angeles. Educational Leadership, 57(5), 38-40.

Best, J., & Kahn, J. (1993). Research in education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bezy, K. (1999). State standards fuel innovation and collaboration. The High School Magazine, 7(4), 5-7.

Bohn, A., & Sleeter, C. (2000). Multicultural education and the standards movement: A report from the field. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(2), 156-159.

Bonstingl, J. J. (2001). Are the stakes too high? Principal Leadership, 1(5), 8-14.

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). A Guide for Preparing a Thesis or Dissertation Proposal in Education. Fifth Edition. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 953)

Bracey, G. W. (2000). The 10th Bracey report on the condition of public education, Phi Delta Kappan, 82(2), 133-144.

Brandt, R. (1995). What to do with standards. Educational Leadership, 52(6), 5.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19(4), 533-546.

Bush, G. (2000). Governor George W. Bush's plans for education in America. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(2), pp. 122, 125.

Caine, R., & Caine, G. (1998). Building a bridge between the neurosciences and education: Cautions and Possibilities. NASSP Bulletin, 82(598), 1-8.

Cawelti, G. (2000). Portrait of a benchmark school. Educational Leadership, 57(5), 42-44.

Chase, B. (2000). Making a difference. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), Will standards save public education? (pp. 35-39). Boston: Beacon Press.

Clarke, K. (2000). Why students are feeling so testy. U.S. Catholic, 65(7), 27.

Cole, K., Coffey, J., & Goldman, S. (1999). Using assessments to improve equity in mathematics. Educational Leadership, 56(6), 56-58.

Coleman, S. (2001, January 29). Phys-ed classes are out, academics in.

Boston Globe, p. B1.

Creswell, J. (1994). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Falk, B. (1997). Using standards and assessments to support student learning, Phi Delta Kappan, 79(3), 190-199.

DeVellis, R. (1991). Scale Development: Theories and applications, applied social research. New York: Sage Publications.

Domenech, D. (2000). My stakes well done. The School Administrator, 57(11), 16-19.

Duke, D., Tucker, P., & Heinecke, W. (2000). Initial responses of Virginia's high schools to the accountability initiative. Charlottesville, VA: Thomas Jefferson Center for Educational Design.

Eisner, E. (2001). What does it mean to say a school is doing well? Phi Delta Kappan, 82(5), 367-372.

Evans, R. (1996). The human side of change. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Falk, B. (2000). The heart of the matter. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freeman, D., Kuhs, T., Porter, A., Floden, R., Schmidt, W., & Schwille, J. (1983). Do textbooks and tests define a natural curriculum in elementary mathematics? Elementary School Journal, 83(5), 501-513.

Galley, M. (2000, December 13). Goals panel draws on lessons from hearings. Education Week, p. 32.

Gagnon, P. (1995). What should children learn? The Atlantic Monthly, 276(6),

62-78.

Gardner, H. (1994). Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice. Teacher's College Record, 95(4), 576-583.

Glaser, R., & Linn, R. (1994). Assessing the century of the child state: Assessment of the national assessment of educational progress in reading. Educational Measurement, 2(3), 273-274.

Glickman, C. (2000/2001). Holding sacred ground: The impact of standardization. Educational Leadership, 58(4), 46-50.

Goleman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.

Grayson, D. (2001, August 8). The writing is on the wall. Bellevue Leader, p. 1, 5.

Gutek, G. (1988). Philosophical and ideological perspectives on education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hall, C., Bolen, L., & Gupton, R. (1995). Predictive validity of the study process questionnaire for undergraduate students. College Student Journal, 29, 234-239.

Hardy, L. (2000). The trouble with standards. American School Board Journal, 187(9), 22-26.

Harmon, H., & Branham, D. (1999). Creating standards for rural schools: A matter of values. The High School Magazine, 7(4), 15-19.

Harrington-Lueker, D. (2000). When educators cheat. The School Administrator, 57(11), 32-39.

Harris, F. (1981). Minimal competency standards: A study of administrator

perceptions relating to its impact on schools in Illinois. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday.

Hess, F., & Brigham, F. (2000). None of the above. American School Board Journal, 187(1), 26-29.

Hirsch, S. (1999). Standards-based professional development. The High School Magazine, 7(4), 31-34.

Hoff, D. (2000, December 13). U.S. students scores drop by 8th grade. Education Week, pp. 1, 20.

Horace Mann League. (1999). Supporting public education: Ideas for relaying the message. Ellensburg, WA: The Horace Mann League.

Houston, P. (2000). A stake through the heart of high-stakes tests. The School Administrator, 57(11), p. 58.

Huberman, M. (1988). The professional life cycle of teachers. Teachers College Record, 91(1), pp. 31-57.

Hurwitz, N., & Hurwitz, S. (2000). Do high-stakes assessments really improve learning? American School Board Journal, 187(1), 20-25.

Jennings, J. (1998). Why national standards and tests? Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Productions.

Johnson, J., Treisman, U., & Fuller, E. (2000). Testing in Texas. The School Administrator, 57(11), 20-26.

Johnson, M. (1981). An analysis of administrator perceptions on mandatory

evaluation programs in elementary and secondary schools. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.

Jones, R. (2000). Making standards work. American School Board Journal, 187(9), 27-31.

Kearns, D., & Harvey, J. (2000/2001). Redefining public schools. Educational Leadership, 58(4), 52-56.

Kearns, J., Kleinert, H., & Kennedy, S. (1999). We need not exclude anyone. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 56(6), 33-38.

Kendall, J., & Marzano, R. (1997). Content knowledge: A compendium of standards and benchmarks for K-12 edcuation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

King, J., & Bunce, M. (1999). A helping hand for educators: Virginia's network of best practice centers. The High School Magazine, 7(4), 24-30.

Knowles, R., & Knowles, T. (2001). Accountability for what? Phi Delta Kappan, 82(5), 390-392.

Koerner, T. & Elford, G. (1999). Data disconnect: Turning the data we have into the information we need. The High School Magazine, 7(4), 20-23.

Kohn, A. (2001). Fighting the tests: A practical guide to rescuing our schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(5), 349-357.

Kotter, J. (1995, March/April). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review, pp. 59-67.

Kotter, J. (1996). Leading change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New York: Harper Perennial.

Kozol, J. (1996). Amazing grace: The Lives of children and the conscience of a nation. New York: Harper Perennial.

Langdon, C. (1997). The fourth Phi Delta Kappa poll of teacher's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 79(3), 212-220.

Lashway, L. (2000). Who's in charge? Principal Leadership, 1(3), 9-13.

Lemann, N. (2000, June, 19). Don't let scandal scuttle standards. Newsweek, 135(25), 54.

Lewin K. (1951a). Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper and Row.

Lewin, K. (1951b). Field theory in social science; Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper & Row.

Lewis, A. (1995). An overview of the standards movement. Phi Delta Kappan, 76(10), 744-750.

Lockwood, A. (1998). Standards: From policy to practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Los Angeles Unified School District. (1998) Results count. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District.

Mackiel, J. (2000, September). A question of standards. NCSA Today, pp. 2, 8.

Maher, R. (2001). Let's not forget the children. Principal Leadership, 1(5), 5-7.

Main, I. (2000). Who's afraid of standards? Association of Supervision and

Curriculum Development, 57(5), 73-74.

Marzano, R., & Kendall, J. (1995). The McRel database: A tool for constructing local standards. Educational Leadership, 52(6), 42-47.

Marzano, R., & Kendall, J. (1996). A comprehensive guide to designing standards-based districts, schools, and classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Matczak, M. (2001, May 10). Write stuff seen in statewide test. Omaha World Herald, p. 1.

Matczak, M., & Goodsell, P. (2001, August 2). Writing skills of students in spotlight. Omaha World Herald, p. 1-2.

Mathers, J. (2001). State performance-based accountability systems: A national perspective. School Business Affairs. 67(9), 6-12.

McColskey, W., & McMunn, N. (2000). Strategies for dealing with high-stakes state tests. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(2), 115-120.

Meece, J., Blumenfeld, P., & Hoyle, R. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(4), 514-523.

Meier, D. (2000). Will standards save public education? Boston: Beacon Press.

Mirel, J., & Angus, D. (1994). High standards for all? American Educator, 18(2), 4-9.

Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (1996). Course handout C3. [on-line]. Available at: http://spsp.clarion.edu/RDE3/C3/C3Handout.html (July 18, 2001)

Monroe, C., Borzi, M., & Dissolvo, V. (1990). Conflict behaviors of difficult subordinates. The Southern Communications Journal, 54(4), 311-329.

Morris, W. (1982). The American heritage dictionary of the English language. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

NSAA Bulletin. (2001, January). 2000 Enrollment Figures for 2001-2002 Classifications. NSAA Bulletin, p. 5.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

National Council on Education Standards and Testing. (1992). Raising standards for American education: A report to Congress, the Secretary of Education, the National Education Goals Panel, and the American people. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (1969). Report of the Committee on secondary schools. New York: Arno Press.

National Education Goals Panel. (1998). National Education Goals: Building a nation of learners. NEGP Homepage. Retrieved January 15, 2001 from the World Wide Web: NEGP@ed.gov

National Forum on Assessment. (1995). Principles and indicators for student assessment systems. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Fair and Open Testing.

Nave, B., Miech, E., & Mosteller, F. (2000). A lapse in standards. Phi Delta

Kappan, 82(2), 128-132.

Nebraska State Department of Education (1998, August 24). Nebraska L.E.A.R.N.S. Omaha World Herald . (Suppl. 1).

Nebraska State Department of Education (1998). Standards change everything: A videotext of standards in Nebraska [Review of Nebraska: L.E.A.R.N.S.].

Nebraska State Department of Education (2000, May) S.T.A.R.S.: Quality criteria for local assessments. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Nebraska State Department of Education (2000, August 2) Rule 10: Regulations and procedures for the accreditation of schools. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Nebraska State Department of Education (2000, October 20) Rule 10: Regulations and procedures for the accreditation of schools: Preliminary draft copy. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Nebraska State Department of Education (2000). 1999-2000 Nebraska State Report Card. Nebraska State Department of Education Homepage. Retrieved January 15, 2001 from the World Wide Web: www.nde.state.ne.us

Nebraska State Department of Education (2001). School-based teacher-led assessment and reporting system update #5. Nebraska L.E.A.R.N.S. Retrieved May 23, 2001 from the World Wide Web: www.nde.state.ne.us/STARSupdate.pdf

Neill, M. (1998). High stakes tests do not improve student learning. A Fair Test Report. Retrieved January 17, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.fairtest.org/k12/naeprep.htm

Nevi, C. (2001). Saving standards. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(6), 460-461.

Noddings, N. (1997). Thinking about standards. Phi Delta Kappa, 79(3), 184-189.

Ohanian, S. (2001). News from the resistance trail. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(5), 363-366.

Olson, L. (2001, January, 11). Finding the right mix. Education Week, 12-21.

O'Neil, J. (1995). On using the standards: A conversation with Ramsay Selden. Educational Leadership, 52(6), 12-14.

Page, M., & Marlowe, B. (2000, December, 13). Battered-teacher syndrome. Education Week. pp. 43, 46.

PBS TeacherSource. (2000). 1,200 lesson plans matched to state and national standards. PBS TeacherSource. Retrieved January 15, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://intraspect.rice.edu/gm/message-1693595811643393.27069

Pasi, R. (2000). The SOL: No easy answers. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 57(5), 75-76.

Pool, C. (1997). Maximizing learning: A conversation with Renate Nummela Caine. Educational Leadership, 54(6), 11-15.

Popham, J. (1999). Why standardized tests don't measure educational equality. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 56(6),

8-15.

Popham, J. (2000). The mismeasurement of educational quality. The School Administrator, 57(11), 12-15.

Porter, A. (2000). Doing high-stakes assessment right. The School Administrator, 57(11), 28-31.

Powell, G. (1993). Women and men in management: 2nd edition. New York: Sage Publications.

Ravitch, D. (1995a). National standards in American education: A citizen's guide. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Ravitch, D. (1995b). Debating the future of American education: Do we need national standards and assessments? Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.

Reeves, (2000). Standards versus sentimentality: Reckoning-successfully-with the most promising movement in modern education. NASSP Bulletin, 84(620), 5-19.

Reid, K. (2001, January, 11). Nebraska: The cornhusker state embraces local assessments rather than commercial tests. Education Week, pp. 151-152.

Reigeluth, C. (1997). Educational standards: To standardize or to customize learning? Phi Delta Kappa, 79(3) 202-206.

Resnick, L., & Nolan, K. (1995a). Where in the world are world-class standards? Educational Leadership, 52(6), 6-10.

Resnick, L., & Nolan, K. (1995b). Standards for education. In D. Ravitch (Ed.),

Debating the future of American education: Do we need national standards and assessments? (pp. 94-119). Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute.

Robinson, G., & Brandon, D. (1994). NAEP test scores: Should they be used to compare and rank state educational quality? Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Romberg, T. (1993). NCTM's standards: A rallying flag for mathematics teachers. Educational Leadership, 50(5), 36-41.

Roschewski, P., Gallagher, C., & Isernhagen, J. (2001). Nebraskans reach for the STARS. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(8), 611-615.

Schein, A. (2001). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. MIT Sloan School of Management. Retrieved March 8, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://www.sol.ne.org/res/wp/10006.html

Schmoker, M. (2000). The results we want. Educational Leadership, 57(5), 62-65.

Schmoker, M., & Marzano, R. (1999). Realizing the promise of standards-based education. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 56(6), 17-21.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Shanker, A. (1995). The case for high stakes and real consequences. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), Debating the future of American education: Do we need

national standards and assessments? (pp. 145-153). Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.

Sousa, D. (1998). Brain research can help principals reform secondary schools. NASSP Bulletin, 82(598), 21-28.

Stiggins, R. J. (2001). The principals' leadership role in assessment. NASSP Bulletin, 85(621), 13-26.

Stotsky, S. (2000). What's at stake in the K-12 standards wars: A primer for educational policy makers. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Sylwester, R. (1995). A celebration of neurons: An educator's guide to the human brain. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Thayer, Y. (2000). Virginia's standards make all students stars. Educational Leadership, 57(5), 70-72.

Thernstrom, A. (2000). No excuses. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), Will standards save Public education? (pp. 35-39). Boston: Beacon Press.

Thompson, S. (2001). The authentic standards movement and its evil twin. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(5), 358-362.

Tucker, M., & Codding, J. (1998, February, 18) Raising our standards for the standards movement. Education Week, pp. 56, 38.

Umphrey, J. (1999). Implementing standards: The next step. The High School Magazine,7(4), p. 5.

U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2000). The use of tests as part of high-stakes decision making for students: A resource guide for

educators and policy-makers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.

Wallace, D. (2000). Results, results, results? Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 57(5), 64-69.

Weiss, C., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 350-367.

Wolf, D., & White, A. (2000). Charting the course of student growth. Educational Leadership, 57(5), 6-10.

Worthen, B., Sanders, J., & Fitzpatrick, J. (1997). Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines. Addison Wesly Longman: New York.

Zmuda, A., & Tomaino, M. (1999). A contract for the high school classroom. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 56(6), 59-61.

Pilot Study

Study Topic: Nebraska public high school principal perceptions of how state standards will impact their schools.

Directions: Please choose the most appropriate answers for the following profile questions. Put an "X" in the box next to your answer for questions 1, 4 and 6. Fill in the box for questions 2, 3 and 5.

Profile:

1. Gender

1. Male		2. Female	

2. Please indicate your age

3. Please approximate your school's percent of free and/or reduced lunches

4. NSAA classification of high school where you are principal

1. Class A		2. Class B		3. Class C		4. Class D	

5. Please list your total years as a principal

6. Your amount of formal standards/assessment/accountability training

1. None	
2. A little	
3. Some	
4. Quite a bit	
5. Have been through an extensive program	

Directions:
Please choose a response for each of the statements listed below. Your responses should be what you believe the situation in your school will be in regards to the Nebraska state standards movement.

Check only one response for each item and place an "x" in the appropriate box.

GD = Greatly Disagree
D = Disagree
N = Neutral
A = Agree
GA = Greatly Agree

2. Teachers
Now that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement has begun to be implemented in Nebraska, I anticipate....

	GD	D	N	A	GA
2.1 Teacher morale will improve.					
2.2 The stress level among teachers will increase.					
2.3 Teachers will resign or retire early (citing standards as a reason).					
2.4 Teachers will spend more time collaborating with one another about teaching, learning, and curriculum.					
2.5 Teachers will engage in more collaborative planning.					
2.6 Teachers will be more afraid to change their current teaching styles and techniques.					
2.7 Teachers will have more committee work responsibilities.					
2.8 Teachers will have more workshops to attend.					
2.9 Teacher morale will worsen.					
2.10 Teachers will spend less time teaching and more time on test preparation activities.					
2.11 There will be a group of teachers in my school who fully support the movement.					
2.12 Teachers will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of students.					
2.13 Record keeping will be an increasing concern for teachers.					
2.14 Teachers will have fewer workshops to attend.					

3. Students
Now that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement has begun to be implemented in Nebraska, I anticipate....

	GD	D	N	A	GA
3.1 More students who need assistance will be identified.					
3.2 More students will become eligible for special education services.					
3.3 Students the farthest behind in their learning will receive the most attention and assistance.					
3.4 There will be a significant improvement in student achievement.					
3.5 Students will leave high school more equipped to be successful.					

GD = Greatly Disagree
D = Disagree
N = Neutral
A = Agree
GA = Greatly Agree

3. Students Continued	GD	D	N	A	GA
3.6 Students will become more accountable for their own success.					
3.7 Students will learn more.					
3.8 Standardized achievement scores for students in the state will increase.					

4. Administration

Now that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement has begun to be implemented in Nebraska, I anticipate....

	GD	D	N	A	GA
4.1 Principals will be under greater pressure.					
4.2 Principals will be asked to gather and assess information concerning the needs of all students.					
4.3 Principals will be asked to send frequent communications to the public and staff regarding school progress.					
4.4 Principals will be asked to communicate to the public and staff about the district's philosophy in regards to standardized testing.					
4.5 Principals will retire early (citing standards as a reason).					
4.6 Principal morale will worsen.					
4.7 Principals will be asked to understand and interpret accountability reports to staff, community, and parents.					
4.8 Principals will have more workshops to attend.					
4.9 Principals will be asked to provide leadership regarding instructional methods to improve test results.					
4.10 Principals will spend more time on overseeing test preparation and analysis.					
4.11 Principals will be asked to plan and develop even more effective in-services for teachers regarding standards and assessment.					
4.12 Record keeping will be a major time constraint for principals.					
4.13 Principals will become more accountable for their school's success.					

5. Resource Allocation

Now that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement has begun to be implemented in Nebraska, I anticipate....

	GD	D	N	A	GA
5.1 The most capable teachers will be assigned to teach the grade levels and/or courses in which students will be taking norm-referenced tests (ie. 11th grade English).					
5.2 Elective courses will be reduced.					
5.3 Teachers will be requesting to be transferred out of grades where norm-referenced testing is done (ie. 11th grade English).					

GD = Greatly Disagree
D = Disagree
N = Neutral
A = Agree
GA = Greatly Agree

5. Resource Allocation Continued	GD	D	N	A	GA
5.4 Vocational education enrollments will decline because students must meet more academic requirements.					
5.5 Textbooks/materials will be purchased based on how well content matches state standards/local content standards.					
5.6 Costs associated with the standards/assessment/accountability movement such as testing and reporting will result in lowered expenditures for other educational supplies.					

6. Instruction

Now that the state standards/assessment/accountability movement has begun to be implemented in Nebraska, I anticipate....

	GD	D	N	A	GA
6.1 Field trips will be eliminated or curtailed.					
6.2 Teachers will spend less time helping individual students.					
6.3 Teachers will move more quickly through the curriculum in order to cover all of the material on which their students will be evaluated .					
6.4 Course content covered after the state test/evaluation period will not be taken seriously by teachers.					
6.5 Teachers will ask students to recall facts more than before the advent of state or local content standards.					
6.6 Subject areas with no state standards or testing requirements will continue to be seen as important.					
6.7 Teachers will spend more time helping individual students.					
6.8 Teachers will ask students to recall facts less than before the advent of state or local content standards.					
6.9 The standards/assessment/accountability movement in Nebraska will not make a significant difference in student achievement.					

Appendix B

Dear Principal:

My name is Mark Weichel and I have been working on a dissertation topic that I believe will be of interest to you upon completion. The dissertation title is "Nebraska Public High School Principal Perceptions of How State Standards Will Impact Their Schools." For my study, I will ultimately survey every public high school principal in the state using survey questions that were gleaned from other studies, reviewed by the metropolitan area assessment task force, and piloted by a group of high school principals. This last part is where I need help from you.

To achieve reliability, I proposed to my committee that I would perform a pilot study prior to full-scale implementation in the fall. Your school is one that I would like to utilize for this requirement. I would truly appreciate it if you would be willing to take 5 minutes or so to look over my survey, mark your answer on each question, and mail the survey back to me. While your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary, your support is greatly appreciated.

In the attached documents you will find a self addressed stamped envelope, a copy of the four-page survey (which is copied on front and back), and a yellow return check-off postcard. When you are done with the survey and are ready to mail it to me, please also send the postcard with your name affixed. When I receive your card, I will know that you have returned the survey, and at the same time, your responses will remain anonymous.

Thanks in advance for your help. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to give me a call at home (293-6961) or e-mail me at [mweich@hotmail.com].

Sincerely,

Mark Weichel
9-10 Principal
Bellevue East High School
mweich@hotmail.com

Appendix C

Dear Colleagues:

My name is Mark Weichel and I am conducting a dissertation study that I believe will be of interest to administrators throughout the state of Nebraska upon completion. The dissertation title is "Nebraska Public High School Principal Perceptions of How State Standards Will Impact Their Schools." While much has been written about education standards, information about administrator perceptions of their implications has been extremely limited.

To make this study one that will truly be informative to those involved with the state's standards/assessment/accountability movement, I aspire to survey public high school principals in Nebraska. With so many principals at this conference, I hope to get a good start in the next few days. Therefore, I have set up a table next to the registration table. A colleague or I will be near the registration table during the key check-in times on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. While your participation is entirely voluntary, it would be greatly appreciated if you would take 5 minutes or so to complete the survey.

The survey you are being asked to complete was first reviewed for validity by the metropolitan-area assessment task force and then piloted by a group of high school principals in June. If you helped with the earlier pilot, thank you and please also participate in the final survey.

If you have any questions, stop by my table. Thanks in advance for your help.

Sincerely,

Mark Weichel

Appendix D

Dear Principal:

My name is Mark Weichel and I have been working on a dissertation topic that I believe will be of interest to you upon completion. The dissertation title is "Nebraska Public High School Principal Perceptions of How State Standards Will Impact Their Schools." For my study, I will survey every public high school principal in the state using survey questions that were gleaned from other studies, reviewed by the metropolitan area assessment task force, and piloted by a group of high school principals.

The revised and final survey instrument was completed and first distributed at administrator days in Kearney last week. You are receiving this letter if you didn't go to Kearney or have time to complete the survey while you were there. I would truly appreciate it if you would be willing to take 5 minutes or so to look over my survey, mark your answer on each question, and mail the survey back to me by **August 24th**. This survey is entirely voluntary. However, my goal is to make the results of this survey truly useful to those involved with the state standards/assessment/accountability movement and aim to have 100% participation. Your help in this is greatly appreciated. If you helped with the earlier pilot study, thank you and please also participate in this revised and final survey sample.

In the attached documents you will find a self addressed stamped envelope, a copy of the four-page survey (which is copied on front and back), and a yellow return check-off postcard. When you are done with the survey and are ready to mail it to me, please also send the postcard with your name affixed. When I receive your card, I will know that you have returned the survey, and at the same time, your responses will remain anonymous.

Thanks in advance for your help. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to give me a call at home (293-6961) or e-mail me at [mweich@hotmail.com].

Sincerely,

Mark Weichel
9-10 Principal
Bellevue East High School

Appendix E

Dear Principal:

My name is Mark Weichel and you may remember receiving a survey from me at Administrator Days in Kearney. The survey is being used to help determine "Nebraska Public High School Principal Perceptions of How State Standards Will Impact Their Schools."

As of September 1st, I had not received a return post card from you. While this survey is entirely voluntary, my goal is to make the results of this survey truly useful to those involved with the state standards/assessment/accountability movement and aim to have 100% participation. Your help in this is greatly appreciated.

In the attached documents you will find a self addressed stamped envelope, a copy of the four-page survey (which is copied on front and back), and a return check-off postcard. When you are done with the survey and are ready to mail it to me, please also send the postcard with your name affixed. When I receive your card, I will know that you have returned the survey, and at the same time, your responses will remain anonymous.

Thanks in advance for your help. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to give me a call at home (293-6961) or e-mail me at [mweich@hotmail.com].

Sincerely,

Mark Weichel
9-10 Principal
Bellevue East High School
mweich@hotmail.com

Appendix F

Dear Principal:

My name is Mark Weichel and you may remember receiving a mailing from me around the first of August when I requested that you take part in a survey involving all Nebraska high school principals. The survey is being used to help determine "Nebraska Public High School Principal Perceptions of How State Standards Will Impact Their Schools."

As of September 1st, I had not received a return post card from you. While this survey is entirely voluntary, my goal is to make the results of this survey truly useful to those involved with the state standards/assessment/accountability movement and aim to have 100% participation. Your help in this is greatly appreciated.

In the attached documents you will find a self addressed stamped envelope, a copy of the four-page survey (which is copied on front and back), and a return check-off postcard. When you are done with the survey and are ready to mail it to me, please also send the postcard with your name affixed. When I receive your card, I will know that you have returned the survey, and at the same time, your responses will remain anonymous.

Thanks in advance for your help. If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to give me a call at home (293-6961) or e-mail me at [mweich@hotmail.com].

Sincerely,

Mark Weichel
9-10 Principal
Bellevue East High School
mweich@hotmail.com

Mark W. Weichel
14408 So. 21st Street
Bellevue, NE 68123
(402) 293-6961

OBJECTIVE

To become a secondary principal or district level administrator.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

May 2002: University of Nebraska – Omaha, NE
Doctor of Education - Educational Administration and Supervision

Dissertation Title: ***Nebraska Public High School Principals' Perceptions of How State Standards Impact Schools***

May 1999: University of Nebraska – Omaha, NE
Master of Science - Educational Administration

August 1997: University of Nebraska – Omaha, NE
Master of Science - Secondary Education

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

December 1995: Midland Lutheran College - Fremont, NE
Bachelor of Arts - Secondary Education

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

August 1999 to present: **9-10 Principal,** ***Bellevue East High School,*** Bellevue, NE

August 1998 to August 1999: **Curriculum Coordinator,** ***Papillion-LaVista Public Schools,*** Papillion, NE

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

August 1996 – August 1999: **Social Studies Teacher,** ***Papillion Junior High School,*** Papillion, NE

SELECTED HONORS

November 2001: **Presenter,** ***TeamMates State Mentoring Conference,*** Lincoln, NE
Topic: "Expanding Mentoring through Summer Activities"

March 2001: **Presenter,** ***ASCD National Conference,*** Boston, MA
Topic: "Full-Service Community Schools"

May 1996: **Program Acceptance,** ***C.A.D.R.E. (Career Advancement and Development for Recruits and Experienced Teachers),*** Omaha, NE
One of only 26 teachers selected to be part of intense 14-month graduate program that consisted of full time teaching schedule and Master's Degree requirements.

REFERENCES

Available upon request